

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

Vol. XLIV, No. 1140

May 1, 1961

PAN AMERICAN DAY • *Remarks by President Kennedy* . 615

THE INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM AND THE PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRESS • *by Adolf A. Berle* 617

PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND CHANCELLOR ADENAUER HOLD INFORMAL TALKS • *Text of Joint Communique* 621

BUILDING AN INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY OF SCIENCE AND SCHOLARSHIP • *Remarks by Secretary Rusk* 624

THE FOUNDATIONS OF WORLD PARTNERSHIP • *by Under Secretary Bowles* 629

DISARMAMENT ISSUES AND PROSPECTS • *by Edmund A. Gullion* 634

For index see inside back cover

THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLIV, No. 1140 • PUBLICATION 7178

May 1, 1961

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

Use of funds for printing of this publication approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1961).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Pan American Day

Remarks by President Kennedy¹

A number of Presidents of the United States have visited the Pan American Union since Theodore Roosevelt shared with Ambassador Nabuco of Brazil the honor of laying the cornerstone of this building over one-half a century ago. It is an honor for me today, as President of the United States, to share the platform with another distinguished Ambassador from Brazil, Ambassador Lobo.²

I doubt whether anyone in all those years has had the privilege of listening to a more thoughtful and wise speech than the one we have just heard from the Chairman of the Council of the Organization of American States. He has defined our task and our responsibility with both precision and feeling.

There is in this last decade, or in the last few years, in the organizations of the hemisphere and in Western Europe of the Atlantic Community, a strong pressure to develop new institutions which will bind us all closer together. I sometimes feel that it is our function and responsibility to use in a more effective manner the institutions we now have.

The Organization of American States represents a great dream of those who believe that the people of this hemisphere must be bound more closely together. It seems to me it is our function and our responsibility, in our day, to make this organization alive, to make it fulfill its function, to make it meet its responsibilities, and not divert ourselves always with developing new in-

stitutions, when we have one which was nurtured in time, which has served well in the past, and which can, if we give it our lasting support, serve us well in the future.

Ambassador Lobo has suggested in his speech that we stand today on the threshold of a new epoch in the development of the American hemisphere. Science, and all the other things which have sprung from science, have brought a better life into the reach of every man and woman in our hemisphere. The 20th century has given mankind the tools to make abundance not the gift of a privileged few but a practical possibility for all who live within our frontiers.

The other change which our century has given us is even more important. That change lies in the new attitude of the mass of our people.

For too long, poverty and inequality and tyranny were accepted as the common lot of man. Today people everywhere are demanding—and are rightly demanding—a decency of life and opportunity for themselves and their children.

This new attitude has produced an immense surge of hope throughout the entire Western Hemisphere.

Our common purpose today is to harness these new aspirations and these new tools in a great inter-American effort—an effort to lift all the peoples of the Americas, including the people of my own country of the United States, into a new era of economic progress and social justice.

Seventy-one years ago the new American nations were exploring new frontiers of international organization when they formed the International Union of the American Republics for regular consultation to solve common problems. Today, as the Organization of American States,

¹ Made before the protocolary session of the Council of the Organization of American States at the Pan American Union at Washington, D.C., on Pan American Day, Apr. 14 (White House press release).

² Dr. Fernando Lobo, Chairman of the OAS Council.

we constitute the oldest organization of nations now in existence.

Already the OAS—our OAS—has moved ahead to meet the new challenges of the 20th century. The Act of Bogotá³ is our charter for economic and social advance. Many of the provisions of this act are Latin American in their inspiration. I am glad that this should be so, because the OAS will thrive and grow only as it derives its vitality from all its members—and only as its members strengthen their own capacity for choice and decision.

The time has come to transform these pledges of social and economic concern into a concrete and urgent collaboration for hemisphere development.

The grand concept of Operation Pan America has already offered inspiration for such an effort. One month ago I proposed a new cooperative undertaking—an *Alianza para el Progreso*—a 10-year program to give substance to the hopes of our people.⁴ I asked all the free republics of the hemisphere to join together to make the 1960's a decade of unexampled progress—progress in wiping hunger and poverty, ignorance and disease, from the face of our hemisphere.

This is surely the contemporary mission of pan-Americanism—to demonstrate to a world struggling for a better life that free men working through free institutions can best achieve an economic progress to which all of us aspire.

But, if we are to succeed, we must take specific steps to realize our common goals—and we must take these steps without delay.

This very week, in Rio de Janeiro, the assembled Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank—representing 20 American Republics—endorsed the principle that development planning on a country-by-country basis was vital to the success of the Alliance for Progress.

Now we may take the next step—to establish the machinery, to adopt the plans, and to accept the commitments necessary to speed the pace of hemisphere development.

Therefore I will shortly instruct the United States delegation to this Council to request a meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at the ministerial level. I will suggest that this meeting be held at a mutually

agreeable date this summer. This will give us all time for the extensive preparation that will be necessary.

This meeting should have three fundamental purposes.

First, it should encourage all the free states of the hemisphere to set deadlines for the completion of preliminary plans for national economic development, as well as to begin long-range planning to meet the development needs of the rest of the decade.

Second, it should set up inter-American machinery to aid participating countries in the rapid formulation of realistic development plans. The OAS secretariat, the Economic Commission for Latin America, and the Inter-American Bank are already preparing a joint recommendation for a hemisphere planning-for-progress staff. I hope that a group of economists, drawn from all parts of the hemisphere, will soon be available to offer assistance to all nations preparing development programs.

Third, the meeting should outline basic development goals. This means elaborating the objectives of the Act of Bogotá in all the key areas of economic and social betterment—in education, in land use and tenure, in taxation, in public health, in the mobilization of resources, in the development of self-help programs, in the stabilization of commodity markets, and in regional economic integration.

These details of procedure may seem dry and technical. But they are the basis for the development of a life for our people to which all of us aspire. They should not obscure the exciting prospects for human growth and liberation which lie within our group.

Our task is to build a society of men and women conscious of their individual identity, of their national aspirations, and also of their common hemisphere interest.

This means re-creating our social systems so that they will better serve both men and our people.

It means social legislation for the workers and agrarian legislation for those who labor on the land. It means abolishing illiteracy, it means schools for children and adults as well, and it means strengthened institutes of higher education, technical as well as humane. It means doctors and hospitals for the sick. It means roads link-

³ For text, see BULLETIN of Oct. 3, 1960, p. 537.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1961, p. 471.

ing the interior frontiers with the markets and ports of the coast. It means the spread of industry and the steady increase of both industrial and agricultural production. And it means, above all, the assurance that the benefits of economic growth will accrue not just to the few but to the entire national community.

Is this not the new ideal of pan-Americanism? On the OAS rests much of the hope of realizing these possibilities; on the OAS rests the duty of giving the people of this hemisphere their long-awaited goal of self-fulfillment. Either the OAS will demonstrate a capacity for practical action in these next years, or else it will become an artificial and legalistic body, without substance, without purpose, and finally without a future.

If we are a united hemisphere, we have no choice but to make the OAS the instrument of our common purposes. And the social and economic programs represent only one part of the OAS agenda. For material growth is not an end in itself. It is rather a means—a means of strengthening the dignity and freedom of the indi-

vidual. This faith in freedom is the enduring essence of our hemisphere cooperation.

This year six of our sister Republics complete the 150th anniversary of their independence. The memory of past struggles for freedom must confirm our resolution to enlarge the area of freedom every year in our hemisphere. In the end our moral unity as a family of nations rests on the ultimate faith that only governments which guarantee human freedoms, respect human rights, and vindicate human liberties can advance human progress.

Franklin Roosevelt, at the Inter-American Conference in Buenos Aires 25 years ago, spoke of our common faith in freedom and its fulfillment. He said it had proved a mighty fortress, beyond reach of successful attack in half the world. That faith, he said, arises from a common hope and a common design given us by our Fathers—in differing form, but with a single aim: freedom and security of the individual.

That is our task. That is our responsibility, and that, gentlemen, is our opportunity.

The Inter-American System and the Program for Economic and Social Progress

by *Adolf A. Berle*

Chairman, Task Force on Latin America¹

Pan American Day [April 14] comes this year in a moment of crisis. Events in the next few months may decide the next phase in the history of the pan-American institution, and with it of the 21 nations constituting the inter-American world. Equally, they may vitally affect the lives of all of us here present.

The situation resembles the European crisis of 1947. Then, Secretary of State Marshall proposed to Europe the famous plan known by his name.²

¹ Address made before the Association of the Bar of the City of New York at New York, N.Y., on Apr. 12 (press release 208).

² For background, see BULLETIN of June 15, 1947, p. 1159.

The Soviet Union countered by declaring the cold war. Climax was reached in December of that year. I had the honor of addressing this association when that fantastic contest was at issue. It was surmounted, and a free, prosperous, and creative Western Europe emerged from the ashes of World War II.

In the Americas this year President Kennedy, after most careful study, proposed the Alliance for Progress.³ His conception, outlined on March 13 last, offered cooperation with all American nations willing to join, designed to achieve three results. The first was to maintain and preserve

³ *Ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1961, p. 471.

governments dedicated to freedom and progress and against tyranny. The second was organization of continuing collaboration in a 10-year plan to assure growth of production by combining American and Latin American resources, capacities, and skills. Its third objective was national planning for social justice, assuring that the fruits of increased production and national incomes should increase the standard of living of the poorest. In simple terms this meant growing opportunity and capacity for all to have land, jobs, housing, health, and education.

Response to this plan was immediate. A number of Presidents of American countries directly communicated to the White House their warm support. No less important, a substantial group of political parties in 12 countries declared their approval of the plan as a platform upon which common effort could be constructed. More formal organization will be reached when the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meets to work out detailed plans.

In the Western Hemisphere today, as in the Europe of 1947, there are obstacles. Some have already been removed by the vast Latin American revolution accomplished in the past 15 years. During that period Latin America discarded most of its tyrants, reconquered freedom for peoples, and reestablished governments responsible to the will of their citizens. President Kennedy's plan would have been meaningless if most Latin American governments were still cast in the mold of the ousted Argentine dictator, Juan Domingo Perón.

Another obstacle is, obviously, seizure of the Cuban regime by the Sino-Soviet bloc and their use of Mr. Castro as a 20th-century Maximilian to advance their imperialist plans for conquest of the Americas. We face an intent, expressed both by Castro and by Communist-bloc propaganda, to use that regime as a spearhead to force similar seizures on all the other nations of the American world. One remembers a similar obstacle in the attempted seizure of Greece in 1947. The same misrepresentations were made then as they are today. The prehensile clutch of overseas aggression was thinly masked by Quisling leaders and mercenary guerrillas. The Greek children were kidnaped and sent to Communist countries, just as Cuban children are now being conscripted,

taken from their families, and sent behind the Iron Curtain.

Screaming denunciation of President Kennedy's initiative by the Cuban Communist camp in 1961 exactly parallels the abuse launched by the Communist satellites against Secretary Marshall. Their attacks are almost amusing. They would like to call it United States imperialism. But as the United States has no empire, their theorists are struggling to invent one. Marxist scholars are now trying to explain that, contrary to Marxist theory, wage levels and standards of living of the poor indeed can and do rise under a free system—rise faster in fact than do standards of living in Communist countries. Most humorous is their reversal on major theory. Imperialism, in Marxian analysis, sought to conquer the markets in Latin America. Now it has been discovered that the United States in fact contributed mightily to Latin America by affording markets for Latin American products in the United States. They now insist it is "aggression" for the United States not to buy Cuban sugar—on a preferential basis. Today it is Marxists who wish to conquer markets—and build armaments to do it. In fact a replacement for the organization formerly provided by empire has been found.

The Primary Struggle

Knowing Cuba and Latin America, I have confidence that Cubans and Latin Americans will overcome this obstacle as Greeks and Europeans overcame it 14 years ago. But we must all remember that the primary struggle now is not against that obstacle; Communist opposition is merely one of the difficulties we must overcome. Our real struggle is to add strength, organization, and resources to the tremendous surge for life, construction, and human improvements sweeping Latin America today. Our ultimate enemies are ignorance and disease, grinding poverty and insecurity, lack of production and lack of social justice—all legacies of a discarded past. Our weapons are food and the technique of increasing its supply; land, its better distribution and use for homes and for production; preventive medicine and care available to the humblest as well as the highest; teaching for children and adults, giving men and women the knowledge they need to enter modern life; credit, to give access to mod-

ern tools and techniques. A mighty weapon is the modern instrument of social planning, to make sure that the surge of production does not merely make the rich richer but directly advantages the poor. The United States has been able to conquer these enemies. No Communist government has yet done so in comparable measure.

To do this, the United States must assist not merely with money. That, of course, will be needed. Even more we can cooperate by joining resources with those of the Latin American countries. Their resources also are great. With modern organization this generation can do for Latin America what our fathers did for us in the United States. The technique of pooled resources under freedom was the great American contribution to modern economic life. Now, in common purpose, we can use that technique to make the freedom real. Freedom from tyranny must be more than freedom to starve. It must be freedom to enter an economic system which gives land to the landless, work to the unemployed, and affords the peon as well as the hidalgo a solid economic base. It must be based on universal education, making the next generation more capable than the last. Then freedom becomes a meaningful concept.

I hope all of you realize how significant this is.

The Inter-American System

The American world was the first to throw off the shackles of empire. Until half a century ago a dozen empires ruled the world—except the Western Hemisphere. Outside the Communist bloc, empires today are not popular. One of their contributions, notwithstanding, ought to be recognized here. They did provide a framework of currency, transport, and marketing, often unsatisfactory but within which economic life could be carried on. We have learned from experience that when their organization is dissolved it must be replaced by something else.

This gap the American world has sought to fill. The Pan American Union, set up in April 1890, was the beginning of a cooperative international relationship. In 1936 it introduced the right and the obligation of consultation between the American nations regarding common problems. In 1938 this was enlarged to include the conception of common defense of the hemisphere.

By the Act of Chapultepec in 1945, in which Governor [Nelson A.] Rockefeller and I were active, more formal agreements for common defense and common economic effort were arranged. These later were embodied in formal treaties of Rio de Janeiro (1947) and the Pact of Bogotá, which established the present Organization of American States, coming into effect in 1951. During the whole period international constitutional law for the hemisphere was meanwhile being pounded out by the resolutions and declarations of a long series of pan-American conferences, regular and special, and occasional consultations of foreign ministers.

This titanic task has received all too little attention. In simple language, there is here being constructed a family of equal and independent nations, working together to take over and perform in common interest the functions formerly performed by empires for their own interest. We are so accustomed to this in the Americas that we take it for granted. How long the road and how steep the mountain traveled and climbed can be seen when we look at Africa today. There, emerging from empire, many free and independent nations are beginning to struggle to achieve common agreement among themselves which has been attained by the American nations through the inter-American organization.

Imperfect as the pan-American organization still is, its institutions have given more peace to a larger area and for a longer period than any international organization in existence.

Need for Economic and Social Development

The chief lack in the inter-American system, I think, has been in the field of economic and social development. Provision was made for plowing that field in the charter of Bogotá. It provided for an economic and social council for "the promotion of the economic and social welfare of the American nations through effective cooperation for the better utilization of their natural resources, the development of their agriculture and industry and the raising of the standards of living of their peoples."⁴ Too little was done to give this council resources and power to realize these objectives, though it maintained a limited program of technical cooperation. The substan-

⁴ Art. 63 of the charter of the Organization of American States.

tial beginning was made last year. The Inter-American Development Bank was brought into existence—it had first been proposed in 1890 and a treaty for it had been worked out in 1943. It now is functioning and has some funds. Appropriation of the \$500 million promised by the previous administration at Bogotá last year has been asked and is now pending before Congress.⁵ I hope and believe the appropriation will promptly pass and that Americans everywhere will support and approve it.

The major steps toward putting an economic and social floor under the inter-American structure were outlined by President Kennedy's speech of March 13 on the Alliance for Progress. That, you recall, proposes a 10-year plan, based in turn on national economic plans of the countries involved. As it is made real, the cooperative union of free nations designed to give to men and women a modern standard of living comes of age. It is both a duty and a pleasure to point out that in conception as well as realization this has been and will continue to be the work of Latin Americans, working with their colleagues in the United States and elsewhere. The list of collaborators is a long roster of distinguished Latin American statesmen, economists, and scholars, many of whom are equal in experience, training, and capacity to the best in the world.

Of particular interest is the fact that the social needs of countries and peoples are the first concern of the new plan. Previous measures sought economic development but took little thought whether the results would be distributed so as to benefit all. This time the welfare of the masses is the primary objective. In liberating the continent from the bondage of misery, we may also liberate the world from a terrible and tragic hoax—the illusion that social progress can be achieved only by blood and by tyranny, by secret police and by firing squads.

So long as the inter-American group of nations stays together, works together, thinks together, dreams together, and so organizes that thinking and working as to bring dreams closer to reality, the progress of the Americas is assured. But this requires organization, and organization requires a clear knowledge of objectives. To raise standards of living in Latin America, more pro-

duction is needed there than now exists. This problem is primarily economic. To assure that increased production shall benefit everyone is a social task and requires social organization. Specifically this means that a substantial share of the production shall go to maintain health, to provide schooling of children, training for technicians, and greater support to universities. It means maintaining the right of free labor to secure for workmen a fair share through wages and social insurance. It means that tax systems shall assure that economic growth does not merely make the rich richer. It means that, in one or another form, ownership of industry in each country shall be spread as widely as possible. It means land programs so that millions of families shall have and can hold their homes and their farms and can be grubstaked with food and tools during the difficult years of clearing and establishment. It means road programs, connecting the great interior frontiers with the great cities and ports to make marketing possible. It means supervised credit so that men, placed on the land, can get tools for their use and training to use them.

The Returns From Education

The Export-Import Bank of Washington, and importantly one branch of the Inter-American Development Bank, have already dealt with and will continue to deal with loans and credit for the classic purpose of increasing production. In this respect their operations follow the accepted lines of long-term commercial lending. The new fund which is presently being added, and later additions to it, must take into account the financing of operations not normally commercial. Education is a major example. My own fear has been and still is that education will receive too little consideration. Overall it is the most profitable expenditure possible. Even in cold economics the returns from education are enormous. But these returns do not come back through normal commercial channels. The amount and handling of this kind of investment, therefore, fall outside conventional molds; but it must not be scrimped on that account.

Here we must seek the understanding and support of the citizens of the United States. I could, if necessary, demonstrate that the effort we are organizing in Latin America in time will return to the United States economic advantage far sur-

⁵ For background, see BULLETIN of Oct. 3, 1960, p. 533, and Apr. 3, 1961, p. 474.

passing the investment. Our European efforts did so. But I prefer to make the case more starkly and simply. This organization, these expenditures, this dedication of resources outside and beyond commercial lines must be done because it ought to be made and done. It ought to be done even if no calculable fragment of advantage ever came back to us. This is our contribution to our world—our affirmation of ourselves—and it transcends calculations of profit or personal benefit. The Alliance for Progress needs, and indeed can have, no better justification.

You will pardon a personal word. I have worked and lived and studied and hoped in this world for 40 years in private and public life. Its scholars and its politicians and its poets and its musicians have taught me most of what I know. I remember golden evenings in Governor Luis Muñoz Marín's kindly Puerto Rican castle by the sea, where came men like Raúl Prebisch of Argentina, Rómulo Betancourt of Venezuela, José Figueres of Costa Rica, José Miró Cardona of Cuba, Pablo Casals with his cello, the presidents of many of the great universities of Latin America, young men dreaming dreams and old men seeing visions. I recall long discussions in Brazil and Colombia with the younger men fighting to plan for the future of those vast nations. I have seen South American cities like São Paulo, equal to the greatest in Europe, built in the short space of 20 years, and villages, which a decade ago were a handful of mud and wattle huts, leap into towns equipped for modern life with houses, schools, electricity, paved roads. By comparison, the similar development of our own West was gradual.

This demand for life, this breaking of old colonial traditions in Latin America, is called a "revolution." So it is, as it is also ours. It is the continuing revolution of the American world. Now it is equipped, staffed, and organized as a new generation of young men who have sought and received university training. They believe, and so do I, that a new world can be made. It will be the world of all the Americas; and it will be great. Its population compares with the great Asian blocs beyond the Pacific—but the American bloc has land and resources.

Above all it has freedom. In a period of a decade it should be possible to increase by at least one-half the living standards of everyone—and of the poorest far more than that. As that decade

draws to a close, it should be possible to open new doors to a larger life for every child and youth in the inter-American world. To assure that this is done—and more besides—is the precise task of the Alliance for Progress working with the American states, the 71st anniversary of whose union we celebrate tonight.

President Kennedy and Chancellor Adenauer Hold Informal Talks

Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, made an informal visit to Washington, D.C., April 12-13 for talks with President Kennedy. Following are texts of a joint communiqué and an exchange of remarks made at the conclusion of their talks on April 13, together with welcoming remarks made by Secretary Rusk on April 11 and a list of the members of the Chancellor's official party.¹

TEXT OF JOINT COMMUNIQUE

White House press release dated April 13

During the past two days the President and the Chancellor have had a most cordial and useful exchange of views on a number of subjects of interest to their two Governments.

Their informal conversations have included, among other things, discussions of: the problem of a divided Germany including Berlin; the current nuclear test ban talks; political and military developments pertaining to NATO; aid to developing countries; European economic cooperation; East-West relations; and the situation in some critical areas of world politics.

Also participating in the talks were Secretary of State Dean Rusk and German Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano.

The President and the Chancellor reaffirmed the position of their Governments that only through the application of the principle of self-

¹ The Department of State announced on Apr. 12 (press release 212) that Chancellor Adenauer and his party would leave Washington on Apr. 16 for a visit to the LBJ Ranch in Texas as a guest of Vice President and Mrs. Johnson. On Apr. 17 Dr. Adenauer addressed a joint session of the Texas State Legislature at Austin. He departed for Germany that afternoon.

determination can a just and enduring solution be found for the problem of Germany including Berlin. They renewed their pledge to preserve the freedom of the people of West Berlin pending the reunification of Germany in peace and freedom and the restoration of Berlin as the capital of a reunified country.

The President and the Chancellor agreed that intensified political cooperation in NATO is indispensable in order to coordinate the efforts of the Allies for the preservation of peace and security in the world.

The President and the Chancellor reaffirmed their support of NATO as the keystone of the common defense of the North Atlantic area. They underlined the conviction of their Governments as to the necessity for the Alliance to maintain and develop further all military means required to enable them to deter effectively a potential aggressor from threatening the territorial integrity or independence of any ally.

Furthermore, the problems of general and controlled disarmament were discussed. The President and the Chancellor are convinced that reasonable, freely negotiated measures to reverse the growth of uncontrolled national armaments will serve to lessen the danger of war and that concurrently measures should be negotiated to secure a life in freedom to all nations. The goal is a general and total peace.

The President and the Chancellor agreed on the importance of a concerted aid effort by the industrialized free world nations in an amount commensurate with their resources and on a basis corresponding to the magnitude of the task. They pledged the support of the United States and the Federal Republic to the fulfillment of the objectives adopted by the member nations of the Development Assistance Group at their meeting in London two weeks ago.²

The President and the Chancellor welcomed the prospective establishment of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development³ as constituting a step of vital importance in the development of an Atlantic Community. The new possibilities which it opens for economic cooperation and economic policy coordination and the means of achieving closer interdependence were also discussed.

² BULLETIN of Apr. 17, 1961, p. 553.

³ *Ibid.*, Jan. 2, 1961, p. 8.

In this connection, the President and the Chancellor agreed that continuing attention should be paid to the balance of payments problem.

The important role of the European Economic Community as a powerful and cohesive force in the core of the Atlantic Community was stressed. The dynamic political and institutional potential of the EEC was agreed to be an important element of present strength for the Atlantic Community.

The fruitful exchange of views which the President and the Chancellor have had, as well as the frank and cordial atmosphere in which the talks were conducted, have contributed significantly to deepening the ties of friendship and understanding between the two countries and to the strengthening of the free world community.

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS

White House press release dated April 13

President Kennedy

We have this communique which will come out in a few minutes. Perhaps I could read it quickly and then I might say a word or two.

[After reading the communique the President said:]

I want to say, speaking as President of the United States, that it has been a great pleasure to welcome to the shores of this country again the Chancellor of the Federal Republic. I don't think that there is any doubt that history will deal most generously with him in writing the history of the Atlantic Community in the years 1945 to the present. His accomplishments have been extraordinary in binding the nations of Western Europe together, in strengthening the ties which link the United States and the Federal Republic.

Therefore, speaking personally and also as President of this country, it is a great honor to welcome again to our shores a friend, a great European and distinguished leader of his country, the Chancellor of the German Republic, Chancellor Adenauer.

Chancellor Adenauer⁴

Mr. President, I was deeply moved and touched by the kind words which you said after reading out the communique. I should like to assure you,

⁴ As interpreted from the German.

Mr. President, that I feel exactly the same way as you do, that it was an extremely great pleasure for me to have come back again to your country in order to have had the opportunity of sensing the atmosphere which I was able to find over here. I especially felt this atmosphere in the discussions which I had with you, Mr. President, and I also felt it particularly this afternoon when I was welcomed in the Senate.

This is the ninth time that I have come here to the United States, and every time I feel deeper and closer linked with your country and with your Government. I am very happy indeed, Mr. President, to have had this chance of meeting you—and you, as the great leader of your country, and therefore the personality that carries such a huge responsibility for the fate of all the free world, and you are dealing with this big task with great energy, with great farsightedness.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

WELCOMING REMARKS BY MR. RUSK

Press release 207 dated April 11

Mr. Chancellor, let me extend to you a warm welcome to Washington. It is a great pleasure for me both personally and officially, and a high privilege as well, to greet you on behalf of President Kennedy and the people of the United States.

We are happy to have you here with us not only because you are so well known as a close and understanding friend of our country but also because you embody so clearly the dynamic and democratic Germany of today. It is most opportune that you could arrange to consult with us at precisely this time when a new American administration is shaping the major policy lines which we will expect to follow during the years ahead. In close cooperation with our allies and friends we shall move together on the path toward free-

dom and peace for all the world. We will expect to benefit greatly from the wise and statesmanlike counsel that you will bring to this endeavor.

Permit me also to extend my welcome to your daughter, Mrs. Werhahn, and the distinguished members of your party, including particularly Foreign Minister von Brentano. I hope that, even though your stay with us will be a short one, the pressure of business will permit you some measure of relaxation and that your visit will prove most pleasant and enjoyable for yourself and your party.

MEMBERS OF OFFICIAL PARTY

The Department of State announced on April 7 (press release 200) that the following would accompany Chancellor Adenauer as members of the official party:

Mrs. Libeth Werhahn, daughter of Chancellor Adenauer
Heinrich von Brentano, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Federal Republic of Germany
Felix von Eckardt, State Secretary for the Federal Press Office
Karl Carstens, State Secretary, Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Hasso von Eitzdorf, Assistant Secretary, Foreign Office
Gunther Harkort, Assistant Secretary, Foreign Office
Heinrich Barth, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Personal Aide to the Chancellor
Peter Limbourg, Executive Assistant to the Foreign Minister
Karl-Gunther von Hase, Officer in Charge, Press Relations, Foreign Office
Horst Osterheld, Chancellery Liaison Officer, Foreign Office
Ulrich Sahm, Officer in Charge for NATO Affairs, Foreign Office
Franz-Joseph Hoffmann, Officer in Charge for North American Affairs, Foreign Office
Albert Reinkemeyer, Officer in Charge for Soviet Union Affairs, Foreign Office
Richard Balken, Officer in Charge for Disarmament Affairs, Foreign Office

Building an International Community of Science and Scholarship

Remarks by Secretary Rusk¹

I wish first to congratulate this great institution on its centennial and on the manner of its celebration. MIT is a symbol of excellence right around the globe, and it is particularly fitting that you have drawn together here some of the most distinguished minds of our era to consider what science and technology mean these days to the world in which we live. The discussions of this distinguished assemblage will be studied with the most intense interest far beyond the walls of this institution. And certainly in the Department of State we shall value the views which have been developed here on the implications of science and engineering for international relations.

My remarks today are not, *horribile dictu*, a major foreign policy address. But they are comments on some of the matters you have had before you. Indeed, they shall be rather simple comments. And I would not wish to apologize to this audience for their simplicity; for many of you have spent much of your lives searching for relatively simple notions which bring order into the understanding of complexity. And what you attempt to do in science, you must not deny to us in politics. Further, we tend to forget or to take for granted the simple and basic thoughts which give us our compass directions and which, even if trite, turn out to be true.

Foreign policy, of course, deals with points of conflict and tension between nations and between groups of nations. Today, for example, the front page of the newspaper which I read at breakfast had stories about Laos, the Congo, Algeria, Vietnam, and Cuba. This is a proper attention to

these places and these events. And we shall have stories of this sort for as long as you and I can read them, because it is our lot—perhaps one should say our exciting privilege—to be caught in a period of history when a world which we have known is disappearing and a world which we are creating is just coming into being. These crises, those of today and those of tomorrow, are and will be dangerous, sensitive, complicated, and will make their contribution to the agonies of policy. And their handling has much to do with the peace of the world, which is just another way of saying that they are of vital concern to each of us in our daily lives. But foreign policy is also concerned with cooperation, with the recognition and nourishment of common interests which bind people together across national frontiers.

Before we pass on, I would like to remind you of the unsung, largely unreported, processes of cooperation which, too, are a part of foreign policy. Among the official international conferences, for example, which are in session today—and there are from 10 to 20 in session on every working day throughout the year—while the front pages speak of Laos, the Congo, and Algeria, there are conferences at work on the further development of trade, on diplomatic intercourse, on the use of food surpluses for food-deficient peoples, on industrial development, on maritime safety, and on a larger role for Africa and the Middle East in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. We sometimes forget that one of the central purposes of foreign policy is not to sharpen conflict but to reduce it, not to make headlines but to shrink them, not to exaggerate the differences of national interest but to build toward a world of freedom under law on the solid foundations of recognized

¹ Made at the centennial celebration of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at Cambridge, Mass., on Apr. 7 (press release 201 dated Apr. 10).

common interests. Indeed, these are the purposes which occupy the bulk of our labors. These are the activities which are the subject of most of our telegrams. These are the great enterprises in which our embassies abroad are most heavily involved. And these preoccupy the great majority of our staff in the Department of State.

At critical times we have our attention drawn to individuals here or there who are in the midst of a particular crisis. We don't ordinarily think of the thousands and thousands of devoted men and women in all parts of the earth who are working with dedication, professional skill, and in many places with gallantry to build a decent world order.

But beyond these official enterprises, I think we might just note in passing what might be called the quietest diplomacy of all. Foreign policy, normally understood, is a matter for governments, but government deals directly with only a fraction of the foreign relations of the American people. To a considerable extent our foreign relations are in the hands of the people themselves, in our case in the hands of Americans by the millions who, in one way or another, are part of one or another unorganized but vast international community made up of private citizens reaching out across national frontiers to pursue peaceful purposes and to weave their own ties, intimate, close, cordial, with associates in other countries. I am thinking of the great community of the arts—or of trade, in which America has some \$33 billion of investments overseas, some 3,000 firms with branches and activities abroad. I am thinking of sports and recreation or even tourism, a million and a half Americans going abroad, spending approximately \$2½ billion. I am thinking of three-quarters of a million foreigners coming to this country to visit—a number we hope very much to expand as rapidly as we can.

International Scientific Exchange

But one of the most impressive and constructive and exciting of all these great private communities is what might be called the international community of science and scholarship. I mention that here because MIT is a thriving and vigorous part of that community. I understand that over 12 percent of your students come from other lands—the second highest percentage among our

institutions of higher education in this country—and that you have the highest number of distinguished scientists and scholars on your faculty. You are a tangible part of this international community. Obviously, science can know no national frontiers, for the building blocks of human knowledge have been put in place by many minds from every continent in a combined effort of man which has recognized no national frontiers and has leapt across the deepest political differences.

I remember many years ago, when we were trying to increase our international scientific exchange program in Government, a distinguished political leader in opposition made the remark that a nation which invented the atom bomb, radar, and penicillin doesn't need scientific exchange. Curiously enough, he thought he was talking about the United States. But the language of science and scholarship eases transcultural discourse. It is in the field of science that we discover that world which President Kennedy recently referred to as the world which "makes natural allies of us all."² Here we are, *Homo sapiens*, a rather insignificant part of a vast physical universe, not knowing quite yet whether we shall come to tolerable terms with that universe, not knowing quite yet whether the wheat rusts or the wheat breeders will win, but knowing that the great issues between man and his environment are issues which reduce to insignificance most of the petty quarrels we spread upon the front pages of our newspapers.

There is here a great universe of common interest, whether in health, or in the production and protection of food crops, or in meteorology, or in the safety of man against the elements; whatever it might be, there is waiting for us only partly utilized a great human adventure which can indeed make allies of us all. For as we look about the earth, we can readily identify certain common, elementary human needs. It would be hard to find those who would rather be sick than healthy, or those who would rather be hungry than fed, or those who would rather be ignorant than informed, or those who would not like to have some degree of predictability with the rising sun, or those who would not like to bring up a family in some sort of decency—common, ordinary, human needs, which exist regardless of race or creed,

² For text of President Kennedy's state of the Union address, see *BULLETIN* of Feb. 13, 1961, p. 207.

regardless of political commitment, regardless of geographical location.

Is this a basis for peace? Perhaps you say we have said too much because the means for satisfying these needs are in short supply and historically these human needs have been a cause for war.

Need for "Development Scientists"

If I might speculate entirely personally for a moment, it seems to me that there is something rather unique about our particular decade, about the period, say, since World War II. We have on the one side what has been called a revolution of rising expectations, appearing not only in the underdeveloped parts of the earth but in our most heavily industrialized Western societies—a keen interest in the removal of the obstacles to a decent life arising from hunger or disease or the absence of physical goods. Alongside of this there is a population explosion which threatens to put intolerable pressures upon the resources of the earth. And yet with this combination of rising expectations and rising populations, of pressures brought to bear upon governments—almost intolerable pressures—to get on with development, one does not find anywhere in the world today any government or any nation making any systematic claim, any policy claim, for what might be called *lebensraum*. No country has an announced policy that the needs of its society require it to move to seize the resources of another society.

It seems to me rather curious at the present moment—and perhaps it is just a moment—that the nations and peoples of the earth seem to be pinning their hopes on the possibilities of scientific and technical development for the satisfaction of the basic human needs. This may be temporary. It may be that we have a chance for a time to get a job done which will implant that idea deeply into the consciousness of man and put us in a position to give up the temptations of predatory seizure of resources elsewhere. But if these expectations are not satisfied and we cannot make tolerable advances, one can see down the road the renewal of pressures for more lands, more resources, and great hazards to the peace of the world.

We must, I think, in this period ahead of us give a great deal of attention, serious attention, thoughtful attention, to what is called development and in that process must elevate our sights as to the role of education. It is understandable

in our own society, where we have been reluctant historically to bring the Federal Government strongly into the educational field, that there has been some reticence or reluctance to have the Federal Government take an intimate part in educational activities abroad. But when we think of development, we must recognize, if we want to be realistic, that education is not a luxury to be afforded when development has succeeded but that education is an indispensable, elementary ingredient in the early stages of developmental processes themselves. It is very simple to explain why, for development requires people—people to lend assistance and to receive it, people to organize societies, people to build institutions, people to train other people—and development needs new knowledge for the solution of practical problems which are still very much on our agenda.

Mr. Eugene Black, the distinguished head of the World Bank, recently referred to our need for "development diplomats" in the years ahead. Surely for as long as we can see into the future we will also need "development scientists" among the social and natural scientists who can bring the best of our thought to bear on how societies can develop efficiently and, perhaps most important of all, promptly, under free institutions.

In our own development programs we hope to expand our interest in education, partly by receiving additional young people here in our own institutions of higher learning and by giving more thought to the educational needs of those who come. But far more important in the long run is that we must try to assist in the development of educational systems and institutions abroad because we ourselves cannot, nor can those associated with us, train sufficient numbers of people in our own institutions to accomplish the great tasks of education in the underdeveloped parts of the world.

Improving U.S. Assistance Programs

As we have turned to review our assistance programs and have tried to think about what the last 15 years of experience—of trial and error and experimentation—have meant, we think there are certain steps which can now be taken which will improve our assistance programs. I am sure most would agree that we could use more efficient administration. We have begun to realize that there is a certain irony in our taking 2 years to

decide to send a team to another country to help it improve its public administration. One of the ways by which we can teach is by example.

We hope to simplify our aid administration, to identify responsibility within it, to speed up its processes, and to put it in a legislative and administrative position to act in a timely fashion. One of the almost terrifying elements in the conduct of our foreign relations is the problem of pace. Events pass by at a breathtaking speed. One of our problems is to act in a timely fashion and not find ourselves in a position of not even knocking off the tail feathers of our problems as they pass us by. In development a small investment at the right time can be far more productive than frequently much larger investment too late.

Secondly, we hope that we shall be in a position to make longer term policies and commitments, to shift somewhat from aid programs on an annual basis to long-range approaches to long-range problems. This has been a problem that has troubled us since 1945; this is not a partisan remark. This has been a part of our difficulty in arranging our assistance on the basis of annual planning. If we can recognize as a nation that we are involved in a long-term engagement in foreign assistance and that we are because we are committed to shaping the course of events which will determine our future, then it will be possible for us to consider doing first things first, to put aside the temptation to move for dramatic short-term effect, and to build solidly from the foundations up and beginning, incidentally, with education.

Further, if we ourselves are in a position to make long-term commitments, it will make it possible for us to say to those who are seeking assistance that we need from them some long-range thinking, some plans, some commitments, and some interest in the institutions which are essential for rational development. Then it will be possible for us to talk with them about the criteria of assistance and to ask them to give us something more solid to support with our assistance.

We also hope to throw much more responsibility on what has come to be called the "country team" located in the country to be assisted. We hope to move from a consideration of projects in Washington to a partnership with the country in the field, with strong responsibility in the hands of

the local ambassador and aid administrator in the country itself. For we have learned all over again what we should have learned long ago: that national economic and social development requires advances on a broad front. It cannot be accomplished through a selected lunge here and another there. It requires attention among others to health, to education, to administration, to public finance, to communications, to work, to livelihood, and to earning capacity. Unless there is a movement on a broad front, lunges are likely to accomplish very little.

Obviously foreign aid cannot accomplish development across the broad front of an entire society. This can only be done from within, and it cannot be done from within solely by governments. It can only be done by peoples, peoples who are stimulated to take an interest in their own aspirations, peoples whose energies and efforts are mobilized to maximum effect, and peoples whose ambitions are geared to the new society which they themselves tell us they want to build. In that situation reasonably modest foreign aid can be brought to bear at certain critical points in order to maintain momentum, in order to help where help is most needed, in a part of a total effort which can challenge the imagination and bring life to the democratic nature of a new society.

A Two-Way Relationship

I have been talking a little about this international community of science and scholarship. Perhaps this is a point to remind ourselves of something which I have commented upon before and will comment upon again. And that is that we Americans must be a little careful that we do not misinterpret our experience since 1945 in foreign aid, that we recognize that it was circumstance and not predestination that put us into position as the giver, the teacher, the lender, the exporter of know-how, the source of assistance. This Nation has been the great receiver of help from others, in science, in the arts, in literature, absorbing into our society the contributions of the cultures of almost every other part of the earth.

When you talk to people these days from distant places about what they can contribute to the enrichment of American life and society, you find them in the first instance incredulous that we ourselves are thinking about such possibilities. Then

they worry about whether they have anything to contribute in which we are interested. And then, when they take a little time off to think about it, they go through the delightful experience of recognizing that there is much which they can give us if they would but make the effort. I hope that we can stimulate this two-way relationship, not to balance the ledger—that isn't important—but to balance the relationship, to change it from one between giver and receiver to one between giver and giver. We ourselves, I think, would learn something about some of the problems of receiving assistance. Suppose another government called and said, "We would like to send you 12 professors of our language," and I called President Stratton³ and said, "Would you like a professor of Hindi?" President Stratton would probably reply, "Well, I don't know, show me the professor." But if we offer professors to a university abroad under an aid program, we tend to be just a little annoyed if the university says, "Show us the professor." I think there are some psychological equivalents that we could develop here if we actively thought out more systematically the contributions which others can make to our own society.

My time has gone. Let me make one closing comment that is peculiarly appropriate at the centennial of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It is somewhat easy to be discouraged about the efforts that we have been making in different parts of the world in the last two decades. I think it is important that we pause for a moment to think of at least one reason why we get discouraged. We and our associates in the free world—in the Atlantic Community as well as in the non-European parts of the world—are committed to a job of building tolerable national

societies at home and a decent structure of world order and peace around the globe. Unfortunately there are those who would tear down whatever it is they cannot control. And tearing down is so much easier than is the building. It is easy to organize a student riot but difficult to build a great university. It is easy to burn a warehouse but difficult to build a viable economy. It is easy to organize a disloyal group in administration but difficult to organize a democratic government.

What is the job of building? Take a moment some time to read the preamble and articles 1 and 2 of the United Nations Charter. They contain a succinct statement of what in the long run the foreign policies of the American people are all about—as well as, indeed, the foreign policies of a great many people in a great many other parts of the world. They form an architectural plan, which can be modified, of course, as we go along, but they nevertheless reflect the aspirations which came out of the fires of war, the commitments to which governments have put their signatures, and the hopes to which men have committed themselves with great service for the last 15 to 20 years. Of course we shall be disappointed, because although man sometimes acts at his best, he can also act at his worst, and the building will be difficult, laborious, and interrupted. But we shall pick ourselves up time and time again after one or another disappointment and return to the labor—let us hope with refreshed energy and renewed determination.

But of one thing, I think, we can be sure, and here the longrun advantage makes itself apparent. On this job of building we are deeply in touch with the essential elements of human nature, with the dreams of man, and on those, as we go about our work, we shall find allies and friends in all parts of the earth.

Thank you very much.

³ Julius Adams Stratton, president of MIT.

The Foundations of World Partnership

by Under Secretary Bowles¹

The first months of a new administration are a time for the reexamination of old policies, old programs, and old concepts. Since January 20th we have been engaged in such a reappraisal.

For instance, there has been a far-reaching effort to give new direction, vigor, and effectiveness to our foreign aid programs.²

This includes a fresh concept of economic and social development which goes beyond the growing of more food and the production of more goods to consider the human factors that give the peasants and workers a greater personal stake in the creation of free societies.

We have also reconsidered the relationship between military and economic assistance.

We have proposed a reorganization to permit better coordination of the numerous activities involved.

We have proposed measures which will permit us to plan our development assistance over a period of years and to make advance commitments which are more responsive to the needs of the receiving countries.

We are also studying gaps in our defense system, the relationship among different types of military facilities, and the need for achieving a balance in all components of our Armed Forces.

We are considering our own defensive power in relation to the defensive capabilities of our allies so that the overall task of free-world defense may be arranged more effectively.

¹ Address made before the Consultation on Immigration Policy of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. at Washington, D.C., on Apr. 13 (press release 215).

² For text of a message on foreign aid from President Kennedy to the Congress, see BULLETIN of Apr. 10, 1961, p. 507.

We are engaged in a reappraisal of our relations with the nations of the Atlantic Community which make up NATO and the OECD.

At the NATO meeting scheduled for early May we will present our views on the goals and functions of the Atlantic Community and on America's relationship with it. The Community relationship is a major cornerstone of American foreign policy which must be strengthened in every way. This requires not only a fresh look at our NATO defenses but at the process of political consultation in NATO and other types of cooperation within the NATO framework.

Simultaneously we are striving to gear the development of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to meet its twin objectives: first, a closer economic relationship among the nations of the Atlantic Community, and, second, as an instrument for cooperation among the industrialized nations of the West in providing more effective assistance to the less developed nations.

There has also been a reappraisal and reorientation of our relations with our Latin American neighbors. We can no longer take them for granted, and President Kennedy's recent speech on the subject³ makes it clear that we have no intention of doing so. In particular, we recognize and welcome their demands for speedier social and economic progress and for social justice. If we are to avoid a repetition of the debacle in Cuba, we must help our friends to achieve these goals within the framework of political freedom.

There has also been a sweeping reappraisal of our approach to the great continent of Africa—

³ *Ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1961, p. 471.

an area four times as large as the United States itself, where more than 20 countries have gained independence in a single decade.

In the Congo independence has brought turmoil, but some other areas have been able to maintain political stability. All of them, however, have a crying need for many forms of development assistance—economic, technical, and educational.

There is also a new look in our relations with Asia. We face critical problems there, especially in southeast Asia, where there is strife and turmoil. Taking the Asian nations as a whole, however, we are beginning to see steady progress toward increased security, freedom, and political stability. Wise policies may encourage further improvement.

Finally, our relations with the Communist nations are also under examination. The difficulties involved in these relationships are both massive and dangerous. Our differences are deep-rooted, and they will not be resolved overnight. But, as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address,⁴ we must at least make a beginning.

Whether broad agreement can be reached on major questions such as arms reduction and control is highly uncertain. Under the best of circumstances, severe competition between the United States and the Soviet Union is likely to continue for years to come.

Yet whatever progress can be made toward easing specific points of tension will reduce the danger of armed conflict in some degree. The stakes are stupendous, and we must do all that we can to lessen the shadow of fear which now hangs over a great portion of mankind.

Defining the Contest With Communism

Each of these reappraisals is vitally important to our security and to our long-range objective of a more peaceful and prosperous world. Yet the most fundamental questions of all involve our national values, the quality of our society, and the objectives which we seek in world affairs.

In order to answer these questions in a meaningful way, we must realize that the differences which exist between the Soviet Union and ourselves are closely related to other profoundly basic world developments which are important in

their own right. On every continent deep changes are under way. Old ways are being challenged and changed. New aspirations are being freed after generations of apathy and confusion.

In no small degree it was our own Revolution, and our example of human freedom and progress, that has stimulated these aspirations elsewhere. Even if the Communist challenge did not exist, this fact alone would impose upon us a heavy obligation to help liberate mankind from the bondage of ignorance, tyranny, and hunger.

Yet the Communist challenge does exist, and it has superimposed a worldwide struggle upon the most intensive and farflung revolution in the history of mankind.

In this contest what are we Americans striving to accomplish?

Many observers will assert that the answer is obvious: We are striving to protect our own security, to maintain our way of life, and to preserve our living standards.

But does this answer provide an adequate base for a worldwide partnership of non-Communist nations? Should we expect our friends abroad, allied or neutral, to labor, risk, and sacrifice in order to help us to enjoy the world's highest living standards here in America? Other nations are not primarily concerned about the security of the United States. Even less are they concerned about our material comforts.

What then about other definitions?

Some say that the world struggle is essentially a contest between the American and Soviet "ways of life." This description is not only misleading but arrogant. There are a great many different "ways of life" among the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, which are as important to the people concerned as our own way of life is to us. While Moscow may believe that one political and social system is destined to absorb the world, we hold no such views. We are not trying to remold the world in the American image.

Others define the struggle as a contest between two types of economic systems—socialism and capitalism. Soviet spokesmen are very fond of this definition. It, too, is false. The Communist economic system certainly does not conform to socialist principles and traditions. The non-Communist world, on the other hand, possesses a variety of economic systems—none of which is

⁴ *Ibid.*, Feb. 6, 1961, p. 175.

pure capitalism and all of which defy classical definition.

Other observers define the world struggle as a contest "to win the minds of men." Certainly the minds of men are deeply involved, as are their hearts and stomachs. Nevertheless we should disabuse ourselves of any notion that we can possess the minds of men or that we have any right to possess them. We are not seeking to capture minds but to liberate minds.

Sometimes the struggle has been called an "East-West" conflict. This easy cliché also misses the point. It would be a terrible mistake to lump "the East" with the Communist bloc. The contest transcends geographic boundaries. The great civilizations of the East and the objectives laid down by such modern Asian leaders as Gandhi are at stake just as are those in the West.

Differing Concepts of Fundamental Values

This leaves unanswered two questions of critical importance:

First, what is it that distinguishes our global objectives from those of the Communist powers?

Second, as we organize to meet the Communist challenge, what common ground exists between us Americans and the non-Communist peoples of the world which can provide the basis for an effective and enduring partnership?

Obviously the challenge has many facets—military, political, economic, psychological, and cultural. However, the heart of the struggle, it seems to me, lies in widely differing concepts of certain deeply fundamental values.

On one side are those who have a common respect for the dignity of the individual, who believe in his infinite capacity for growth, and who believe in the right of the individual to choose for himself, to develop himself, his views and his capabilities, as he sees fit—as long as he does not interfere with the rights of others.

On the other side are those who believe that man is born to serve society and that the state is the principal object of human effort.

This distinction between those who believe that man exists for society and those who believe that society exists for man did not originate with Marx, Lenin, or Stalin. The conflict of concepts goes far back into history. It was the basis of the competition between the Greek city-states and

the Persian Empire. It was also the basis of the conflict between the emerging Christian world and the old Roman Empire, which eventually resulted in the collapse of the latter.

When we begin to see the conflict in these fundamental terms, it becomes clear that its implications go far beyond the narrow, immediate security interests of the United States. It involves all people everywhere, and generations yet unborn.

The material strengths which we can bring to bear on this challenge are very great. Our economic system is capable of producing 40 percent of the industrial goods in the world. Most of our people are well educated by world standards. Our Military Establishment is fantastically powerful. We have a treasure house of scientific and technical know-how.

These material assets are of the utmost importance. Without them we would be at an impossible disadvantage in this world of conflict and aggression. Yet those who point proudly to our superabundance of automobiles, bath tubs, and television sets as evidence of our right to "world leadership" have scant understanding of the dynamics of our era. We cannot survive as a great and influential nation unless we can help forge a working partnership of the non-Communist peoples of the world. And in the long, difficult effort to create such a partnership our dedication to human freedom, to social justice, and the rights of others may prove to be fully as important as our money and our weapons.

One hundred and eighty-five years ago in our Declaration of Independence we held these universal values to be self-evident. They lie at the heart of our Bill of Rights and of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. In essence they reflect mankind's deepest aspirations as set forth in the Sermon on the Mount and are repeated in one form or another in every great religion.

Perhaps the greatest testimony to the strength of these ideas is the fact that totalitarian leaders have sought to borrow them, strip them of their meaning, and pervert them to their own ends.

Our own right to claim them as part of our American tradition is clear. We were the first nation to throw off colonial bonds through a revolution of the majority. We were the first to launch a great experiment in popular democracy. We were the first to provide individual opportu-

nity to all citizens through a system of universal education.

This brings us to the central question: What meaning do these values have for us today?

Clearly it is not enough for our generation of Americans to offer lipservice to the principles and ideas which have been the basis of our greatness in generations past. The difference between asserting moral positions for the limited purposes of "psychological warfare" and living by them because they are the warp and woof of our national life is precisely the difference between manipulation and genuineness, tactics and truth.

Thus the test of our sincerity will not be the frequency with which our revolutionary slogans resound in political speeches, television extravaganzas, and broadcasts of the Voice of America but our actual day-by-day performance on the issues which move mankind.

Purpose of U.S. Foreign Aid Program

Against this background let us consider some key aspects of American foreign policy. What, for instance, is the precise purpose of our foreign aid program?

Are we trying only to keep a favorable majority in the United Nations? Are we trying only to build more profitable markets? Are we trying to win the gratitude of the impoverished segment of mankind? Are we simply trying to outdo the Communists? Are we trying to demonstrate the superiority of the so-called "American way of life"?

Although these are the reasons many Americans give themselves, the most casual reflection will demonstrate that they are inadequate and inaccurate. Foreign aid, no matter how massive, will not buy for us the loyalty of any nation. It is folly to assume that simply by filling Asian and African stomachs we can automatically turn their grateful owners into friends and allies.

The primary, all-important objective of our assistance program can be simply stated: It is to help new and struggling nations create conditions which offer their people the steadily expanding measure of justice and opportunity which is essential to political stability and to a free society. Such societies will never lack dedicated defenders of freedom ready to meet aggression from any source.

In our efforts to help create societies whose citi-

zens believe them to be worth defending, we must also recognize that rapid economic growth by itself is not enough. Indeed such growth releases powerful forces which, once out of hand, can lead to increasing political ferment as well as to revolutionary upheaval.

What counts as much as economic expansion is the manner in which the expansion is achieved and what happens to individual human beings in the process.

A giant dam, for instance, may add substantially to the gross national product of a particular country. But it will prove to be a source of discontent, instead of pride, if the individual peasants see that the benefits accrue largely to the landlords and the money lenders while they and their families remain impoverished and insecure.

Improving the Attitudes of Americans

The objectives, content, and direction of our foreign development programs are one example of the way in which the traditional ideas and aspirations of the American people may be reflected in our foreign policy. Equally important are the attitudes which we Americans adopt in our contact with foreign citizens.

Although we are desperately anxious to be understood, we have not always taken the time or made the effort to understand others. In some countries where we have spent millions of dollars, our efforts have been handicapped by the tactless, arrogant attitudes on the part of some Americans.

Too often we have seemed to "talk down" to people, without interest in their culture or opinions. Too often we are best remembered for our shiny new automobiles and luxurious living, for our failure to travel outside the large cities or to mix with the people as friends and neighbors.

During the years ahead we must make sure that the Americans which our Government sends abroad—in our economic aid programs and our military programs—understand and respect the people with whom they work and live. And let us encourage similar attitudes on the part of other Americans going abroad—technicians, businessmen, and tourists.

It is not enough, however, to improve our attitudes toward people in other countries. We must also improve our attitudes toward our fellow Americans here at home.

Among the hundreds of thousands of foreign

citizens that visit this country each year, many obtain an adverse and unbalanced impression of American life. It is futile to talk about our ideals and principles unless we express them in our day-to-day behavior—in the whole range of actions involving our relationship with the peoples of other countries and in our own.

When a foreign diplomat is refused service in a restaurant in Maryland because his skin is darker than that of most Americans, we lose something that cannot be compensated for by grants of arms or bulldozers.

If we profess to believe in spiritual values, we must prove it by devoting a greater measure of attention to things of the spirit.

If we profess to believe in the dignity of man, we must adopt programs and policies which promote such dignity.

If we profess to believe in the revolutionary principles of political democracy, we must be prepared to accept and support the gropings toward freedom which exist in almost every part of our modern world.

The Years Ahead

The years immediately ahead are likely to be decisive for generations to come. We face these years with many advantages which the Communists do not have and can never have.

Our first advantage is the fact that our Nation is the great pilot demonstration of the most powerful principles and ideals in history, the ideals and principles which created the American Revolution. This revolution is still alive and marching throughout the world. It is a permanent revolution—a revolution not alone of politics but of agriculture, industry, education, and all facets of human endeavor.

Our opportunity now, in concert with other freedom-loving peoples, is to bring the principles of this revolution to bear on world problems.

Our primary advantage lies in the fact that our national interests do not require us to do injury to others—to weaken them, to exploit them, to delude them, or to enslave them. On the contrary, our own security and well-being depend in large measure on the progress which other peoples make toward freedom, economic progress, and social justice. Without such progress, what do they have to defend?

This means that for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Communist lands, we want no more and no less than what they want for themselves and their children—a chance to grow, to improve, to think, to learn, to choose, to be themselves.

This identity of national interests can readily be demonstrated. For instance, if we were to list what we Americans want to have happen in India, Tanganyika, Italy, or Brazil during the next decade, our list would be nearly identical with that of any good Indian, Tanganyikan, Italian, or Brazilian.

If a Communist were asked to prepare similar lists of Communist objectives in these same countries, his lists would be dramatically different.

In other words, the values we are seeking to defend are the universal values for which men—black, white, brown, and yellow—have fought and struggled since the beginning of time. This is the basis of our individual strength. This is the foundation on which a worldwide participation of free peoples must be built.

As we develop our national policies to meet this challenge in the perilous but profoundly promising decade of the 1960's, let us never fail, in the absence of arms controls, to possess the military strength upon which our survival depends.

Nor can we afford any lasting slowdown in the blessings on which the material abundance of our society depends.

But let us never fall into the fatal trap of assuming that national power in this revolutionary world can be measured by our output of automobiles and missiles alone.

One hundred and three years ago Abraham Lincoln stated the proposition clearly. "What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence?" he asked. And then he answered, "It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling sea coasts. . . . Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere."

If our generation of Americans can capture and maintain the vision of Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt, we will have regained our sense of national purpose. And simultaneously we will have laid the foundation of an invincible world partnership for freedom and peace.

Disarmament Issues and Prospects

by Edmund A. Gullion

Deputy Director, U.S. Disarmament Administration¹

I sincerely welcome this opportunity to speak about disarmament with a group representing such a wide cross section of American life and interests.

We stand today at the threshold of a new cycle of the disarmament negotiations which promises to be active and accelerated. Last Thursday, April 6, I was in Geneva, where the conference on discontinuance of nuclear testing is taking place, when Vice President Lyndon Johnson met with Ambassador Arthur Dean, our principal negotiator.²

The United States has returned to the conference table at Geneva to complete the work of drafting and signing a sound and fair treaty as soon as possible. In support of this objective our delegation has presented a series of new proposals which constitute the most significant overall move made by either side in the negotiation since it commenced more than 2½ years ago.³

New Western Proposals

Following an intensive and by no means easy assessment by the new administration of the pertinent scientific and military considerations, the United States delegation, supported by the United Kingdom, made these proposals, which I summarize:

1. An extension of the projected moratorium on small underground test explosions—the moratorium

to commence with treaty signature—from 27 months to 3 years;

2. An offer, subject to the approval of Congress, to permit participating parties of either side to inspect the nuclear devices used in a seismic research program undertaken to improve the means of detecting underground explosions, or for other peaceful purposes, in order to assure that these programs could not be used to cloak weapons tests;

3. A ban on tests in outer space to be monitored by a control system based on recommendations made in 1959 by technical experts of the United States and the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union;⁴

4. Relocation of the proposed number of fixed control posts which would result in a reduction of from 21 to 19 in the number stationed in Soviet territory;

5. An equal quota of 20 annual on-site inspections each in the United States and the United Kingdom, on one hand, and in the Soviet Union on the other, to determine whether certain disturbances in the earth are caused by nuclear explosions or by earthquakes; and

6. A control commission composed of four Western, four Communist, and three other nations, this composition being contingent on the unhampered, independent, day-to-day operation of an effective control system.

Those of you here who are familiar with the complex issues of the negotiations can best appreciate how much movement these propositions involve upon our part. But anyone, I think, should

¹ Address made before the Seventh National Conference on World Disarmament and Development at Washington, D.C., on Apr. 10 (press release 202).

² For a statement by Vice President Johnson, see BULLETIN of Apr. 24, 1961, p. 580.

³ For background, see *ibid.*, Sept. 26, 1960, p. 482.

⁴ For background, see *ibid.*, July 6, 1959, p. 16.

be able to identify in these proposals a far-reaching offer designed to produce an early, reliable agreement fair to both sides.

Such an accord would be a breakthrough in the long history of disarmament negotiations and could not fail to have a good effect on United States-Soviet relations.

The situation at Geneva now is that we are awaiting Soviet reactions to these proposals, which were laid down on the opening day of the resumed session and which Ambassador Dean has been expanding in detail since March 21.

If there is to be agreement the Soviet Union must also move from the positions it has previously taken, for example, on staffing of the control organs and the inspection teams—which would reduce the process of verification and control under the treaty to mere self-inspection.

New Soviet Proposals

The Soviet delegation also made some new propositions on the opening day. In negotiations up to this point it had been agreed that the inspection system would be headed by a single, impartial administrator, operating within a mandate clearly defined by the treaty. The Soviet Union now apparently wants to substitute for this official a three-man directorate theoretically representing the Communist bloc, the Western nations, and the uncommitted countries.

This troika-type directorate resembles the kind of thing with which the U.S.S.R. proposes to replace the Secretary-General in the United Nations and which would so impair the effectiveness of that body. Under the test-ban treaty it might paralyze the inspection system by subjecting it to new and crippling built-in vetoes.

The administrator of the treaty system *must* be able to act, within the provisions of the treaty, rapidly and directly when suspicious events have been certified by objective criteria as being eligible for inspection. I do not believe a three-headed organism could do this effectively any more than I would choose to have three pairs of hands at the steering wheel of my car on the highway.

On the other hand, we may not yet have heard all the Soviet delegation has to say about this proposition. It was put forth before the Soviet Union had had a chance to contemplate the horizons opened by our own new proposals. We hope, therefore, that the Soviet Union will be

able not only to give a constructive response to our ideas but that it will also reconsider the effect on the prospects for the treaty of its proposed triangular directorate.

I must emphasize that we are continuing to strive patiently and with stubborn hope for an agreement at Geneva. We know very well how difficult it is to approach decisions or to change positions on matters so bound up with the national security. We wish the Soviet Union to have due and reasonable time for reflection.

Yet we must be aware that what we now have, in the absence of a treaty, is a moratorium on nuclear test explosions of any kind, destructive or benign, based on the mere unverified declarations of the participating countries.

We are observing this moratorium. We expect the Soviet Union to do likewise and do not make any accusation of bad faith, but, given the closed nature of their society, we can be less sure of them than they can of us. So long as the standstill is faithfully observed it prevents not merely the refinement of weapons but also the perfection of means to detect illicit testing and the development of atomic energy for peaceful engineering projects, under conditions which preclude dangerous radioactive fallout.

The present situation not only puts a premium on bad faith but it also actually impedes peaceful progress. This is why President Kennedy instructed Ambassador Dean to determine within a reasonable time whether a treaty with adequate safeguards was going to be possible.⁵

An international agreement which put a stop to nuclear weapons testing would be an epochal first step toward bringing under political control the cosmic forces which science has unleashed. But it would be *only* a first step; its intrinsic importance, however great, would be less than its significance as a precedent for general disarmament.

In the time remaining I should like to discuss approaches to the larger problem of comprehensive disarmament.

We have agreed with our allies and the Soviet Union that general disarmament negotiations will be resumed sometime this summer.⁶ We see this

⁵ For a statement by President Kennedy announcing Ambassador Dean's departure for the conference, see *ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1961, p. 478.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Apr. 17, 1961, p. 568.

as a renewed opportunity to bring an early and sure end to the arms race. The administration has, therefore, initiated an intensified study of United States disarmament policy under the direction of Mr. John J. McCloy, Adviser to the President on Disarmament. Heavily engaged in this undertaking are the United States Disarmament Administration, of which I am a part, and other agencies of Government.

While this study is in progress it would be premature for me to comment in detail on United States disarmament policy. Our position is now subject to the same searching review which the administration has given to policies on atomic testing. In this endeavor it is very helpful to have counsel from all responsible quarters, such as yours.

In the meantime, it may be useful to restate our goals and to comment on two major problems, namely, our differences with the U.S.S.R. on how much disarmament we must negotiate all at once and, secondly, the problem of compliance and the institutional requirements of disarmament.

First Steps and the Ultimate Objective

The ultimate objective remains a secure, free, and peaceful world in which there can be general disarmament under effective international control and agreed procedures for the maintenance of peace and the settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

To define an ultimate objective, however, is by no means to deny the urgent need for progress now. On the contrary, unless we can achieve some early steps to halt and turn back the arms race, the ultimate objective may recede still further until it and we are blotted out in bloody mist.

It is in this very matter of taking first steps, of agreeing on confidence-building measures, of launching pilot operations that we have found ourselves in a baffling impasse with the Soviet Union.

We have thought that the world would require some experience of success in reducing armaments before it could proceed into extensive disarmament. We have thought that these measures could well include, in addition to a nuclear test ban, steps to secure the world against surprise attack and, more recently, against the mounting danger of war by miscalculation—whether it be a misread-

ing of an adversary's intentions, a wrong interpretation of a blip on a radar screen, or a mistake in calculating a nation's will and capacity to resist.

We have proposed such things as the verification in advance by the United Nations of all space launchings; an agreement with the Soviet Union on a cutoff of production of nuclear material for weapons use, to take effect as soon as an inspection system is agreed upon by a meeting of experts; an agreement that no nation will put into orbit or station in outer space weapons of mass destruction; and joint scientific undertakings such as space probes.

We have proposed the creation of a United Nations surveillance force to be available at the call of nations caught up in crisis. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has recently suggested that nations at some distance from the great centers of military power "may find it to their advantage to undertake agreement among themselves to limit their arms to internal security purposes."⁷

We do not know yet whether the Soviet Union will eventually consent to join in any such endeavors. It has not yet done so apparently on the grounds that we were trying to achieve inspection—or espionage—without real reduction of armaments, in spite of the fact that these projects seem to us to involve the least onerous forms of inspection.

The Soviet approach up to now calls on every country great and small to commit itself not only to the goal of "general and complete disarmament" down to the level of hand weapons for police forces but also to agree on the whole detailed process and program clear to the end, which they have said can be achieved in about 4 years. It seems to us that their position is tantamount to saying that until everything is agreed nothing can be attempted. This whole-package approach tends to frustrate early results and sets the stage for protracted negotiations.

The Soviet Union has, however, indicated some interest in "partial measures"; it professes a willingness to adjust the requirements of inspection to the particular task involved. We do not really know precisely what they mean by these declarations and how they reconcile them with their existing positions. In the forthcoming negotia-

⁷ *Ibid.*, Apr. 10, 1961, p. 515.

tions we shall certainly try to pin down a common understanding and application of concepts like these. We should hope that the Soviet Union has an apprehension equal to ours of the dangers of the existing situation and of the risks of its continuance and sufficient to cause it to see the wisdom of early, partial measures.

Institutional Requirements of Disarmament

As to the other problem, which I wish to take up briefly, namely, that of institutions for disarmament, we are, of course, studying the Soviet position along with our own, especially in relation to the means of insuring compliance at each stage. This is, of course, not an easy matter when it involves two societies organized as differently as ours and the Soviet Union, one of which cherishes its openness as the other guards its secrecy as a great national asset.

There is at present no sufficiently strong international authority to administer sanctions in the way in which our Government enforces domestic law. We must rely therefore upon arrangements which will give each party an assurance that all other parties are in fact living up to their commitments. We must rely upon verification and disclosure, rather than upon sanctions, to promote compliance.

This is an important limitation. We do not attempt to get people to obey the traffic laws without the sanction of fines or confinement or other penalties. We cannot assume that, once a disarmament agreement is concluded, each party will resist the temptation to conceal clandestine armaments. Nevertheless, we must, for the present, proceed in disarmament negotiations on the experimental assumption that the possibility of exposure can effectively deter violations in the early stages.

This limitation places a heavy responsibility upon diplomacy. The U.N., as it now exists, the inspection arrangements we envisage for disarmament, the provisions we must make for the settlement of disputes, the plans we must lay for institutions to keep the peace in an advanced stage of disarmament—all these at this stage will be no more effective than the determination of the nation-states concerned to make these institutions work. The success of any international body depends ultimately upon the continuing mutual good will and identity of purpose of the sovereign

states composing it. It is for this reason that progress in disarmament is inevitably linked with progress in resolving our differences and reducing international tensions. It would be difficult, indeed, to achieve day-to-day effectiveness in one organ of the U.N. while waging a cold war in another—to reduce arms in one part of the world while waging war in another.

In the face of the very real danger of a nuclear disaster all must agree that efforts to reduce tensions should be assiduously pursued by all sides, whether they be disarmament, arms control, procedures for the settlement of political issues, extending the means for settling international disputes, or the removal of barriers to commence cultural exchange and overall mutual understanding.

These things should be thought out and attempted as soon as an opportunity is offered or can be created without waiting for agreement on a massive disarmament package.

To make a safe agreement will require bridging enormous gaps between the Soviet Union and ourselves not only on particular issues but also in historical experience, ideology, psychology, semantics, values, and ethical concepts.

We must be understanding and patient about these things, but at the same time we must be vigilant. Anyone who has read the Moscow declaration of 81 Communist parties or Premier Khrushchev's January address knows that at the same time that the U.S.S.R. calls for complete and general disarmament it maintains an iron determination to push the Communist revolution whenever feasible or to capture other revolutions for the Kremlin.

No negotiator can take much for granted in dealing with the Soviet Union. But every negotiation must strive to find a common ground. The Soviet Union must be as conscious as we are of the implications for human security of the advance of technology, the cost of armaments, and the horrors of nuclear warfare.

The fantastic forward leap of technology may soon place certain objects of arms control beyond hope of control. Just as the proliferation of nuclear stockpiles made impractical the aims of the Baruch plan to do away entirely with such stockpiles, so tomorrow may the seeding of the earth with missiles and the sowing of outer space with nuclear weapons render even the most power-

ful and creative diplomacy impotent to achieve disarmament. We may lose that chance, which some philosophers of arms control think we now have, of fixing upon a certain potential stability in the strategic military confrontation and of utilizing it to turn the level of armaments down and ever downward in equivalent amounts on both sides of the equation.

Soon also we must move together to stop the drain of armaments on world resources. Civilized modern man presently spends an estimated \$330 million a day on military costs. The talents and energies of some 50 million civilian and uniformed personnel are consumed in man's search for security amid constantly changing weapons systems. And all this vast expenditure of effort and resources on uneconomic goods generates a further insidious side effect of which President Eisenhower gave valedictory warning: "... the acquisition of unwarranted influences, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex"¹—a development which could have implications for the fabric of society.

The Soviet position at international disarmament negotiations has sometimes seemed to me to vary with the fluctuations of obscure contention within the Soviet Government. One such uncertainty turned for a time on whether or not a nuclear war could be a disaster for the Soviet Union. I believe it is safe to say that the Kremlin is now convinced (even if Communist China may not be) that general nuclear war, if not a defeat for the Soviet Union, would at least be a disaster for everybody. About this they are sincere.

I have known some of the Soviet negotiators and have imagined I knew when they were sincere and when they were not. They were, I believe, sincere in their awareness of the effects of atomic warfare. Premier Khrushchev has termed nuclear war "madness." Here, at least, there may be grounds for agreement.

President Kennedy, while stressing the need for sufficient military strength, described the United States position in his inaugural address:²

"But neither" he said, "can two great powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing

to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war."

Here then is the grim and crucial conundrum which we are still given a chance to resolve in new and serious negotiations.

Africa Freedom Day

Remarks by President Kennedy¹

White House press release dated April 15

I want to say, speaking personally and as President of the United States, that it is the greatest possible pleasure to join with you today in celebrating this most important occasion. I think the fact that there are so many Members of the House and Senate from the Hill, and so many members of the United States Government, indicates our great interest, our profound attachment to the great effort which the people of Africa are making in working toward political freedom and also working toward a better life for their people.

We also are a revolutionary country and a revolutionary people, and therefore, though many thousands of miles of space may separate our continent from the continent of Africa, today we feel extremely close.

I think that the preoccupation of the United States with the cause of freedom not only here but around the world has been one of the most important facets of our national life. All of our early revolutionary leaders I think echoed the words of Thomas Jefferson that "the disease of liberty is catching." And some of you may remember the exchange between Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Paine. Benjamin Franklin said, "Where freedom lives, there is my home." And Thomas Paine said, "Where freedom is not, there is my home." I think all of us who believe in freedom feel a sense of community with all those who are free, but I think we also feel an even stronger sense of community with those who are not free but who some day will be free.

¹ Made at a diplomatic reception held by Secretary Rusk at the Department of State on Apr. 15 for African ambassadors accredited to Washington and their staffs. Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, as well as officials from various departments of the Government, were also present. Africa Freedom Day was originally proclaimed in a resolution of the first Conference of Independent African States at Accra in April 1958.

² *Ibid.*, Feb. 6, 1961, p. 179.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

I must say as an American that I can think that all of us in this country can find continued inspiration and I think all of you who are citizens of countries who have newly emerged to freedom can find some inspiration in the Farewell Address of George Washington.

Washington wrote the address in 1796 in order to eliminate himself as a candidate for a third term but most importantly to give some guidance to the new Republic. His text in his speech is alive with the spirit of liberty. It speaks of a union of States as a political fortress against the batteries of internal and external enemies. It counsels against adopting hasty improvisations at the expense of principle which thus might undermine what cannot be directly overthrown.

There is wisdom and foresight in Washington's instructions to cherish public credit and to promote as an object of primary importance institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. Washington told our forefathers in this country to reject permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others and said any nation failing in this is in some degree a slave. He warned against foreign influences which seek to tamper with domestic factions, who practice the arts of seduction to mislead public opinion. His rule for commercial relations was to have with them as little political connection as possible.

Every year in the United States Senate we read the speech, and we still get great benefit from it. I hope that in your experiences you will also get benefit from it. I want to stress today that we look to the future with the greatest degree of confidence and hope, and I hope that the people of your continent recognize that we wish to be associated intimately with them, that we wish for them the same things we wish for ourselves: peace, the opportunity to develop our own institutions in our own way, to be independent not only politically but in all of the other kinds of independence which make up important national security.

Your brightest days are still ahead. I believe ours are also. And I hope that when the history of these times is written—when the history of the decade of the sixties is written—they will record a more intimate and closer attachment year by year between your countries of Africa and this country of the United States.

May 1, 1961

President Extends Greetings to First President of Togo

The White House on April 15 made public the following letter from President Kennedy to Sylvanus Olympio, President of the Republic of Togo.

APRIL 13, 1961

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I take great pleasure in extending to you, both personally and officially, my very warm greetings and heartiest congratulations upon the occasion of your inauguration as the first President of the Republic of Togo.

The overwhelming majority by which you were elected reflects the Togolese people's admiration and appreciation for the enlightened leadership you have given during the achievement and consolidation of your country's independence.

May your years in office be marked by peace and prosperity for the Togolese people and by increasingly friendly relations between Togo and the United States.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

His Excellency
SYLVANUS OLYMPIO
President of the Republic of Togo
Lomé

President Congratulates Soviets on Orbiting a Man in Space

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

White House press release dated April 12

The achievement by the U.S.S.R. of orbiting a man and returning him safely to ground is an outstanding technical accomplishment. We congratulate the Soviet scientists and engineers who made this feat possible. The exploration of our solar system is an ambition which we and all mankind share with the Soviet Union, and this is an important step toward that goal. Our own Mercury man-in-space program is directed toward that same end.

MESSAGE TO CHAIRMAN KHRUSHCHEV

White House press release dated April 12

Following is the text of the President's telegram to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, N. S. Khrushchev.

APRIL 12, 1961

The people of the United States share with the people of the Soviet Union their satisfaction for the safe flight of the astronaut in man's first venture into space. We congratulate you and the Soviet scientists and engineers who made this feat possible. It is my sincere desire that in the continuing quest for knowledge of outer space our nations can work together to obtain the greatest benefit to mankind.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

Rockefeller Public Service Awards

Remarks by Secretary Rusk¹

President Goheen [of Princeton University], Mr. Rockefeller, distinguished award winners, and ladies and gentlemen: It is a very great privilege indeed for me to be here and to speak on behalf of Secretaries McNamara, Freeman, Udall, Ribicoff, and for myself as well in expressing our pleasure that these distinguished awards have been given to deserving civil servants within our respective departments.

It is especially fitting that we celebrate the public service under these present auspices, because those of us who have thought about the public service over the years know of the pre-eminent role which Princeton University, and particularly its Woodrow Wilson School, has been playing for many years in this field.

And if I might make a personal remark, I think that one would have to know him intimately to know how extensive is the true public service of John D. Rockefeller III, because if you left him on his own he would never let you discover the range of his service to the Nation as a private citizen. The combination of the man and the

¹ Made at the Rockefeller Public Service Awards luncheon at Washington, D.C., on Apr. 11 (press release 213 dated Apr. 12). Charles E. Bohlen, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, was one of the six Government employees receiving an award.

university makes these awards, it seems to me, peculiarly fitting.

I have been somewhat intimidated by the formality of the program, which indicates that I am to give what is called the "principal address," because there is one thing which the professional public service has not accomplished, to the best of my knowledge, and that is the ability to prepare speeches for busy Cabinet officers. And in any event I approach a prepared text with some hesitancy because I shall never be able to forget the professor on the West Coast who habitually assigned to his graduate students the preparation of his speeches, and on one notable occasion he faltered halfway through because he had come upon a blank page on which was written, "Improvise for 5 minutes."

We could not celebrate these award winners today without adding a recognition of what really won them their awards. Ranged alongside of them are those who give them gallant support, who kept many a long and lonely vigil, who were the built-in deflators of official pomp and sense of self-importance. I am referring of course to the wives of these award winners. I wonder if you will please rise.

We celebrate today men who might probably 100 years ago have been called by John Stuart Mill "bureaucrats," when he remarked that "the work of government has been in the hands of governors by profession; which is the essence and meaning of bureaucracy." We think of the bureaucrat in somewhat different terms these days. News media have bureaus, but we don't think of newspapermen as bureaucrats. Business is filled with the hidebound follower of rigid rules, but we don't call people in business bureaucrats. We seem to reserve that term for those who are in public service.

As a matter of fact, I would suggest that it is a good thing that a certain tension exist between a democratic people and those who are carrying responsibilities in office. The professional public servant has to hew to that delicate line between disinterested service, on the one hand, and a full acceptance of both the spirit and the letter of policy handed down by those who are designated by the people to formulate policy.

I once made the remark to a British friend, in compliment to the British civil service, that the existence of this fine civil service must inject a

great element of stability and confidence into the British political system, commenting that of course civil servants did not have party loyalties. He smiled and said, "You know, you have missed the point. The British civil servant gives his loyalty to one party at a time." This is a delicate thing to do, and it needs to be policed by public opinion.

High Standards of Accountability

Further, the public servant is holding in the most literal sense a public trust. There is a difference between his public office and his private interests. The funds he uses are held in trust to be used on the highest standards of accountability and performance. He is frequently dealing with authority, and under our system and our traditions those who exercise the authority of the state need the constant supervision and restriction of the critical judgment of our fellow citizens. Many public servants are dealing with matters of the deepest moment to the life, to the health, and to the safety of the Nation, and it is inevitable that we should be sensitive to their performance.

I think it is fair to say that the critics and the criticized are not always on the same footing of responsibility, for there is a considerable difference between conclusions and decisions. As private citizens, as commentators, as lecturers, we can afford the luxuries of conclusions. We can defer our conclusions until all the evidence is in. We can change our minds without serious repercussions. But the public servant, whether a political appointee or a career man, is dealing daily with decisions. He is forced to look at the problem as a whole. He is forced to act when action is required, even though he would prefer to wait. He is forced to recall that taking no action is itself a decision, and he is forced quite properly to live with the results.

These are only a few of the elements which explain some of those exacting standards to which Mr. Bohlen referred, the exacting standards of public service which are equaled by few professions in the land.

We began this Republic with some hopes for a professional public service. When our Federal Government was strongly centered under the traditions of Virginia, it was the hope of those who founded our Republic that we would quickly de-

velop a professional service. One can recall the words of Jefferson:

I return with joy to that state of things when the only questions concerning a candidate shall be: Is he honest? Is he capable? Is he faithful to the Constitution?

But through turbulent decades of the mid-19th century we drifted away from the aspirations for a career service, until later in the century the first Civil Service Commission was appointed only in 1871. It lasted only 3 years, and it was not until the assassination of President Garfield by a disappointed jobseeker that the Pendleton Act was passed, which reestablished the Civil Service Commission in 1883.

In our particular system the notion of a well-founded, solid career service is relatively new. But I suppose we could agree that there could be no more important goal than strengthening the Nation's career service, not because it is now weak but because we must expand our capacity and ability to meet the rapidly multiplying demands of this era.

I think it was at Princeton some years ago that a group sat down to analyze what it would be good for a Foreign Service officer to know. When they thought about the demands upon him, I believe they concluded that he needed to have a thorough grasp of at least 21 academic disciplines, ranging from history to nuclear physics.

There is no doubt that with the increasing complexity and pace of modern life the demands upon our public service have never been more severe and the challenges to people who occupy public posts never more exacting. The old adage that "there is more room at the top" was never truer than today, when the demands for top performance are so exacting.

I think there is another reason for us to think about the quality and performance of our public service, particularly at this time. There are entering the family of nations a very large number of new societies, newly accepting responsibilities for their own affairs. Many of these, dozens upon dozens of newly independent nations, are having to build their public service, some of them in a vacuum, many of them—indeed most of them—without adequate personnel. These peoples are now sitting as juries, trying to decide upon the institutions which they shall adopt as their own—whether free institutions or those

more authoritarian in type. The quality of their administration will largely determine their success in erecting free institutions. In this field, what we do by example—not merely by lecturing—can have the most profound influence on what they do and thus upon the shape of the world.

Need To Strengthen Public Service

The need to strengthen our public service comes about because of a rapid increase in the number of jobs requiring the highest level of executive talent. When we look at the tasks which have been laid upon our great departments of Government and consider the impact of what we do and how we act on the world these days, the wide range and limitless responsibilities of our public service come into full view.

We need to fill our pipelines with talented young people to rise to leadership. We need to take into account the flexibility, the imagination, the vision, as Mr. Rockefeller put it, to recognize change and adapt swiftly to new environmental factors. No one can cling for long to outworn customs in this society of ours. Alfred North Whitehead in his *Adventures of Ideas* puts it this way:

... tradition is warped by the vicious assumption that each generation will substantially live amid the conditions governing the lives of its fathers and will transmit those conditions to mould with equal force the lives of its children. We are living in the first period of human history for which this assumption is false.

... in the past the time-span of important change was considerably longer than that of a single human life. . . .

Today this time-span is considerably shorter than that of human life, and accordingly our training must prepare individuals to face a novelty of conditions.

One must suggest in this connection—and I suspect that it would be a comfortable and exciting thought for Princeton—that because of these time factors there is still room for the basic liberal education which enables men to adjust to change; for the accelerating rate of change in our industrial society brought about by scientific discovery, technical progress, and rapid mechanization requires the administrator and executive in Government and business to become better educated and intellectually prepared. Our age of science calls for less and less muscle and more and more mind to control both matter and men.

In all the complexities which confront us in

our troubled world, we may find that if we use our wits we shall not need to use our weapons.

As we look toward strengthening our public service, we must, I think, take into account the fact that in our society the public service is recruited voluntarily. We do not draft men and women nor assign them by fiat. We must entice them, stimulate and attract them, and support them in Government service in such a way as to make such service a satisfying, lifetime career. One of the great pleasures in working with dedicated career servants is to see the quiet, sustained satisfaction which they derive from serving their country.

We must continue to encourage our educational institutions to acquaint the Nation's youth with the opportunities which exist in the field of public service and public administration.

We must give greater attention to fair employment practices, of which government has always been a stout champion but not always an ardent practitioner.

We must in our service provide full opportunity for growth—the growth of individuals—for nothing is more disconcerting than to find men in service who have not grown with the years and with the opportunities. As we continue our programs of inservice training for Government employees and as we expand opportunities for career development, we shall be filling a larger percentage of those notches at the top with career men and women.

We can as citizens applaud, encourage, and express our appreciation for institutions like the Woodrow Wilson School and individuals like John D. Rockefeller III for the attention which they themselves are giving to excellence in the public service. The Rockefeller Public Service Awards, recognizing and honoring civilians in the Federal Government for distinguished service, focus public attention on the enormous variety of opportunities and satisfactions in the public service and enable their distinguished recipients to pass on to others the knowledge which they have gained from their years of experience.

Some 10 years ago I made the remark that it may well be that the most important single factor of the 20th century is that the energy, wealth, power, and imagination of the American people are devoted to peace, liberty, and the economic well-being of ourselves and others. For us to

keep this type of commitment in mind, we shall need dedicated public servants of the highest order. The world is moving much too fast for us to stand still or to smile in satisfaction at all that we have in possession.

So let us honor these unusual public servants for the reality of their hold on truth. Let us also remember, with Archibald MacLeish, that

Freedom is never an accomplished fact. It is always a process. Which is why the drafters of the Declaration spoke of the *pursuit* of happiness: They knew their Thucydides and therefore knew that "The secret of happiness is freedom, and the secret of freedom, courage."

And here we give our thanks and our appreciation to these great public servants.

United States and Morocco Sign Investment Guaranty Agreement

Press release 214 dated April 13

The Department of State announced on April 13 that the United States and Morocco have signed an agreement which will provide additional encouragement for the investment of private American capital in Moroccan business enterprises.

The agreement, effected by an exchange of notes between the two countries, extends the provisions of the U.S. investment guaranty program to American private investments in Moroccan business ventures. The program is administered by the U.S. International Cooperation Administration as part of the Mutual Security Program.

Under the agreement the U.S. Government will provide guaranties that American private capital invested in Moroccan enterprises, and local currency receipts from such investments, will remain convertible into dollars. The program also provides guaranties against losses due to expropriation or damage resulting from war.

The U.S. Government guaranties will be available for new U.S. private investments of capital goods, services, patents, and loans which are approved for purposes of the ICA guaranty by the Government of Morocco. For this insurance the U.S. investor will pay a premium of one-half of 1 percent per year for the amount of investment guaranteed under each of the three types of insurance.

The agreement with Morocco makes it the fifth African nation to participate in the investment

guaranty program. Other African nations participating are Ghana, Liberia, Sudan, and Tunisia. Negotiations are now in process with other African countries, including some of the newly independent nations.

Altogether 51 countries have instituted the investment guaranty program. However, mutual security legislation was amended in 1959 to limit the program's operation to economically underdeveloped areas. The program is presently operative in 37 countries and dependent territories of some others. As of December 31, 1960, a total of \$560.8 million in ICA guaranties had been issued for investments in countries already participating in the program, and applications in process exceed \$1.4 billion.

Inquiries and applications for guaranties should be addressed to the Investment Guaranties Division, International Cooperation Administration, Washington 25, D.C.

THE CONGRESS

President Recommends Participation in Effort To Save Nubian Monuments

The White House on April 7 made public the following letter from President Kennedy to the Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn. An identical letter was also sent to Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate.

White House press release dated April 7

APRIL 6, 1961

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 502(c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I transmit herewith my recommendations for participation by the United States in the international campaign initiated by UNESCO to preserve the ancient temples and other monuments in the Nile Valley which are now threatened with inundation as a result of the construction of the Aswan High Dam.

I consider it to be in the interests of the United States to assist in rescuing these historic remains

of a former civilization from destruction—and to join the international effort to conduct exploration and research in the threatened area of Nubia before it is submerged for all time.

The significance of these ancient monuments has been discussed by President [Gamal Abdul] Nasser of the U.A.R. who recently said "... we pin our hopes on the preservation of the Nubian treasures in order to keep alive monuments which are not only dear to our hearts—we being their guardians—but dear to the whole world which believes that the ancient and the new components of human culture should blend in one harmonious whole." Reflecting similar sentiments, President [Ibrahim] Abboud recognized Sudan's responsibility to the rest of the world for the ancient monuments within its borders "... since the history of the Sudan is but a part of the history of Mankind."

The United States, one of the newest of civilizations, has long had a deep regard for the study of past cultures, and a concern for the preservation of man's great achievements of art and thought. We have also had a special interest in the civilization of ancient Egypt from which many of our own cultural traditions have sprung—and a deep friendship for the people who live in the valley of the Nile. In keeping with this tradition, and this friendship, I recommend that we now join with other nations through UNESCO in preventing what would otherwise be an irreparable loss to science and the cultural history of Mankind.

The international effort now under way to save the many ancient temples in the United Arab Republic and Sudan is an operation of a magnitude that cannot be borne by one or even a few nations. Its total cost is estimated at 75–100 million dollars. Because of the immense size of the task, the Director General of UNESCO, at the request of the Governments of the United Arab Republic and of the Sudan, has appealed to all nations and peoples to join in a common undertaking to save these historic monuments from destruction.

In return for assistance, the Governments of the United Arab Republic and of the Sudan, in declarations of October 1, 1959 and October 24, 1959, respectively, have offered to cede, with certain exceptions, at least half of the finds to parties carrying out excavations in Nubia. The U.A.R. Government has also declared its willingness to authorize excavations outside the threatened area

at sites in Lower, Middle and Upper Egypt, and has stated it is prepared to cede, with a view to their transfer abroad, certain Nubian temples and a large collection of antiquities which are now part of Egyptian state collections. It is also my understanding that the Government of the United Arab Republic is prepared to extend the above privileges and benefits to American museums and institutions if effective financial assistance from the U.S. Government is forthcoming.

The United Arab Republic has itself pledged the Egyptian pound equivalent of \$10 million for the UNESCO campaign, to be paid over the next seven years. Seven other nations have either paid in or pledged contributions. Still others are furnishing assistance in kind, have sent expeditions to the area, or are seriously considering financial assistance. To date the United States Government has made no financial contribution to the program, and only modest funds have been forthcoming from private sources.

It is important to note that all United States contributions to this international campaign can be in the form of U.S. owned Egyptian currency generated under P.L. 480. The total of all the contributions recommended below can be met from the portion of these currencies available for U.S. use which is determined to be in excess of U.S. prospective requirements.

The task of saving the Nubian monuments can be conveniently divided into two parts: (A) the preservation of the massive temples of Abu Simbel; and (B) the preservation of the temples on the Island of Philae and the remaining lesser temples in the threatened area.

(A) The cost of preserving Abu Simbel—dedicated to Rameses II and Queen Nefertari, and built in the 13th century B.C.—has been estimated at approximately 60 to 80 million dollars. Two major plans have been advanced for saving these monuments: One recommends building a coffer dam around them; and the other proposes to sever the temples from the rock cliff of which they are a part and lift them 200 feet to the future level of the Nile. Each of these plans entails serious difficulties, and further studies are being made. Therefore I feel it would be premature to recommend, at the present time, that any U.S. funds be provided for this purpose.

(B) The preservation of the Philae temples,

the lesser temples, and also the exploration of the threatened region.

1. The second most important group of monuments are the temples on the Island of Philae—known as the “Pearl of Egypt.” Recent engineering studies have indicated that these monuments can be saved at a cost of approximately 6 million dollars. There would be no more effective expression of our interest in preserving the cultural monuments of the Nile Valley than an American offer to finance the preservation of these temples. I am directing that the Egyptian pound equivalent of 6 million dollars be set aside for this purpose. When required an appropriation to cover the use of this sum will be sought.

2. The cost of preserving the lesser temples in the U.A.R. and in the Sudan will be approximately 9.6 million dollars. I recommend an appropriation covering the use of the Egyptian pound equivalent of 2.5 million dollars as the U.S. contribution toward the removal of these temples.

3. In addition to preserving these monuments there is a pressing need for extensive archeological and prehistory research in the Nubia. Much of the threatened area, particularly in the Sudan, still remains unexplored by archeologists. Therefore, a large-scale program of investigation and exploration must be undertaken if the undiscovered treasures and antiquities of this region are not to be lost forever. For this purpose the Egyptian and Sudanese Governments have thrown open the Nubia to archeological teams from other countries, and several institutions in the United States have either sent expeditions to the area or have expressed their desire to do so. I recommend an appropriation covering the use of the Egyptian pound equivalent of 1.5 million dollars for grants to American archeological expeditions and groups doing related research in Nubia which are prepared to meet their own dollar requirements. These grants will be administered by the United States.

4. Of course Egyptian pounds cannot be used

to finance either the preservation of temples or exploration and research in the Sudan. However, the Government of the U.A.R. has indicated its willingness to permit the conversion of the Egyptian pound equivalent of \$500,000 into Sudanese currency. Therefore I will set aside this amount to be converted for use in the Sudan from the sums I am requesting for research and for preservation of the lesser temples.

5. I intend to appoint a commission of government officials and leading Egyptologists to make plans for the acquisition and distribution of the antiquities ceded to the United States as a result of our contribution.

In making these funds available the United States will be participating in an international effort which has captured the imagination and sympathy of people throughout the world. By thus contributing to the preservation of past civilizations, we will strengthen and enrich our own.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

87th Congress, 1st Session

- Small Business Exports and the World Market. Report of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business on encouragement and expansion of exports by small business. S. Rept. 89. March 27, 1961. 42 pp.
- Sugar. Report, together with individual views, to accompany H.R. 5463. S. Rept. 125. March 28, 1961. 12 pp.
- Reemployment of Foreign Service Officers or Employees. Report to accompany S. 644. S. Rept. 127. March 28, 1961. 3 pp.
- Extension of Sugar Act. Conference report to accompany H.R. 5463. H. Rept. 212. March 29, 1961. 2 pp.
- Trading With the Enemy Act. Report of the Senate Judiciary Committee made by its Subcommittee To Examine and Review the Administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act. S. Rept. 132. March 29, 1961. 8 pp.
- Commending Project Hope. Report to accompany S. Con. Res. 8. S. Rept. 138. March 30, 1961. 2 pp.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings¹

Scheduled May 1 Through July 31, 1961

GATT Contracting Parties: 18th Session	Geneva	May 1-
U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America: 9th Session	Caracas	May 1-
U.N. ECOSOC Commission on Commodity Trade: 9th Session	New York	May 1-
14th International Cannes Film Festival	Cannes	May 3-
ICEM Executive Committee: 17th Session	Geneva	May 3-
UPU Executive and Liaison Committee	Bern	May 4-
FAO/UNICEF Joint Policy Committee: 3d Session	Rome	May 8-
ILO Inland Transport Committee: 7th Session	Geneva	May 8-
NATO Ministerial Council	Oslo	May 8-
Inter-American Nuclear Energy Commission: 3d Meeting	Washington	May 9-
WMO Executive Committee: 13th Session	Geneva	May 11-
ICEM Council: 14th Session	Geneva	May 11-
International Cotton Advisory Committee: 20th Plenary Meeting	Tokyo	May 15-
PAHO Executive Committee: 43d Meeting	Washington	May 15-
FAO Group on Citrus Fruits: 2d Session	Rome	May 18-
FAO Group on Grains: 6th Session	Rome	May 18-
FAO European Forestry Commission: 11th Session	Rome	May 22-
11th Inter-American Conference	Quito	May 24-
Executive Committee of the Program of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees: 5th Session	Geneva	May 25-
UNESCO Executive Board: 59th Session	Paris	May 25-
ITU European VHF/UHF Broadcasting Conference	Stockholm	May 26-
International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries: Scientific Committee	Woods Hole, Mass.	May 29-
WHO Executive Board	Geneva	May 29-
ILO Governing Body: 149th Session (and its committees)	Geneva	May 29*
FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: 34th Session	Rome	May 30-
International Rubber Study Group: Enlarged Management Committee	London	May
International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: Working Party on Abstention Reports	Tokyo	May or June
International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: Working Party on Scientific Reports	Tokyo	May or June
International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries: 11th Annual Meeting	Washington	June 5-
International Labor Conference: 45th Session	Geneva	June 7-
FAO Expert Meeting on Economic Effects of Fishery Regulation	Ottawa	June 12-
U.N. ECE Housing Committee: 21st Session	Geneva	June 12-
8th International Electronic, Nuclear, and Motion Picture Exposition	Rome	June 12-
FAO Council: 35th Session	Rome	June 19-
FAO/OIE Meeting on Emerging Diseases of Animals	Ankara	June 19-
International Whaling Commission: 13th Meeting	London	June 19-
11th International Berlin Film Festival	Berlin	June 25-
7th International Congress on Large Dams	Rome	June 26-
IAEA Board of Governors: 22d Session	Vienna	June
U.N. Trusteeship Council: 27th Session	New York	June
IMCO Maritime Safety Committee: Expert Working Group	London	June
U.N. Economic and Social Council: 32d Session	Geneva	July 4-
8th Inter-American Travel Congress	Rio de Janeiro	July 5-
FAO Technical Meeting on Plant Exploration and Introduction	Rome	July 10-
Development Assistance Group: 5th Session	Tokyo	July 11-
WMO Regional Association III (South America): 3d Session	Rio de Janeiro	July 11-
IBE Council: 27th Session	Geneva	July
24th UNESCO/IBE Conference on Public Education	Geneva	July
FAO North American Forestry Commission: 1st Session	México, D.F.	July
South Pacific Commission: Meeting of Urbanization Committee	Nouméa	July

¹ Prepared in the Office of International Conferences, Apr. 14, 1961. Asterisks indicate tentative dates. Following is a list of abbreviations: ECE, Economic Commission for Europe; ECOSOC, Economic and Social Council; FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization; GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; IAEA, International Atomic Energy Agency; ICEM, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; ILO, International Labor Organization; IMCO, Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization; ITU, International Telecommunication Union; NATO, North Atlantic Treaty Organization; OIE, International Office of Epizootics; PAHO, Pan American Health Organization; U.N., United Nations; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; UNICEF, United Nations Children's Fund; UPU, Universal Postal Union; WHO, World Health Organization; WMO, World Meteorological Organization.

President Kennedy Reaffirms U.S. Support for NATO

*Remarks by President Kennedy*¹

I am delighted to offer the warm welcome of the United States Government to the Chiefs of Staff of the nations of NATO as you assemble here for a meeting of the Military Committee. We, of course, take satisfaction in having your representatives with us regularly, in permanent session, but it is especially good today to have in Washington the Military Committee itself. Moreover, it is for me much more than a ceremonial pleasure to meet with you.

You hold a critical responsibility in the affairs of NATO, and I want to talk with you about the substance of the task and about the necessary relation between you as military officers and others of us as political leaders.

NATO, as you gentlemen know, is at a turning point in its military planning. In Supreme Headquarters and in many of the capitals of the Alliance, work on our future needs is going ahead. As part of this effort, we in the Government of the United States are now well advanced in a careful study of our own view of the military policy of NATO.

Vice President Johnson explained last week in Paris² our belief that there should be a reinforcement of the capabilities of NATO in conventional weapons. NATO needs to be able to respond to any conventional attack with conventional resistance which will be effective at least long enough, in General [Lauris] Norstad's phrase, to force a pause. To this end we ourselves mean to maintain our own divisions and supporting units in Europe and to increase their conventional capabilities.

In addition to strengthened conventional forces we believe that NATO must continue to have an effective nuclear capability. We hope to consult closely with our allies on the precise forms which the nuclear deterrent should take in future years. In his address last week Prime Minister Mac-

millan pointed out the urgency of this question. The United States means to do its full share in working toward a good solution of the problem, and we believe that the clarity and firmness of our own commitment to the full defense of Europe can be helpful in this direction.

I do not want to go further today in the elaboration of these matters. The proper first forum for their consideration in NATO is, of course, the North Atlantic Council, and, moreover, questions of this importance also require careful discussions in each country at the very highest levels of government.

But before I turn to other matters let me comment briefly on one further military point. In our studies we have found a serious need for a sensitive and flexible control of all arms, and especially over nuclear weapons. We propose to see to it, for our part, that our military forces operate at all times under continuous, responsible command and control from the highest authorities all the way downward—and we mean to see that this control is exercised before, during, and after any initiation of hostilities against our forces, and at any level of escalation. We believe in maintaining effective deterrent strength, but we believe also in making it do what we wish, neither more nor less.

In stating this doctrine I am reaffirming principles to which the responsible military leaders of NATO have always adhered—but I am also assuring you that the political leadership of the United States will apply both energy and resources in this direction.

And this brings me to my second main point. NATO is remarkable among the alliances of history in its combination of political, military, economic, and even psychological components. What NATO is, at any time, depends not only upon its forces in being but upon the resolution of its leaders, the state of mind of its peoples, and the view of all these elements which is held by the Kremlin.

In this situation it is clearly necessary that there should be close understanding between political leaders and the senior military officers. In our countries, of course, final responsibility always rests with political authorities, and we also have a tradition of respect for the professional judgment of professional soldiers. But in NATO,

¹ Made before the Military Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization at Washington, D.C., on Apr. 10 (White House press release).

² BULLETIN of Apr. 24, 1961, p. 581.

from the beginning, it has been essential that neither class of men should accept any arbitrary division of our problems into "the political" and "the military." The crucial problems have all been mixed. Political leaders have had a duty to share with their senior officers a full understanding of the political purposes of the Alliance, and military leaders for their part have had to recognize that in NATO all the important military problems are political problems too.

This recognition of the interconnection between policy and force is an even more compelling necessity today, especially in all the questions which relate to the command, the deployment, and the possible use of nuclear weapons.

In the months ahead, as we share in the framing of NATO's policy and in new decisions which may guide us safely toward the future, we shall need to have the closest and most understanding communication, not only from country to country but from soldier to civilian. Political planning must be aware of military realities, and military plans in turn must be responsive to political considerations—among them such varied and important matters as resource capabilities, national attitudes, and other Alliance objectives like our common purpose to advance the economic welfare of the whole free world. Our force goals, our military policy, our deployments, and our war plans themselves must all reflect the purposes and spirit of our great community. Military and political problems are not separable, and military and political men must work ever more closely together.

I hold an office which by our very Constitution unites political and military responsibility, and therefore it is no more than my duty to pledge my own best effort to keep these two kinds of problems together in my mind. I ask the same of you.

In ending, gentlemen, let me turn for one moment from our problems to our accomplishment. NATO has kept the peace of Europe and the Atlantic through 12 dangerous years, and in that time our community has grown in strength and in well-being. This is no small accomplishment. I offer to you, and through you to all of NATO's armed forces, the thanks and congratulations of the people and Government of the United States. Let us go on together in this high task of guarding a free community's peace.

President Emphasizes Importance of EPC Meeting

White House press release dated April 14

Following is a statement by President Kennedy on the occasion of the departure of the U.S. delegation to the meeting of the Economic Policy Committee of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation at Paris, April 18-19.¹

The United States delegation leaves this weekend to participate in the Paris meeting of the Economic Policy Committee of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), April 18-19. Now that the U.S. has ratified the convention establishing the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)²—the body which will succeed OEEC—the Paris meeting takes on a high and symbolic significance. It will be the first meeting of the Economic Policy Committee to be conducted within the new spirit of the OECD—a spirit which the United States has undertaken to foster by assuming the responsibilities of full membership.

We are entering a new era in which the day-to-day economic affairs of the Western nations are becoming more and more closely intertwined. We face problems and opportunities to which we must respond in full awareness of the common stake in sound decisions. To overcome recession and unemployment, to achieve and maintain high rates of growth, to encourage world economic development—these are no longer merely independent national goals to be pursued by each of our 20-member countries in isolation from the others. They are also common goals which call for sustained common action through economic policies which reflect our common interests.

The strength of the delegation which will represent us at the EPC meeting underscores the importance which we attach to this new departure in our economic relations with Western Europe and Canada and the seriousness with which we have accepted our obligations in the new Organization. The delegation includes Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Ad-

¹ For a list of the members of the U.S. delegation, see BULLETIN of Apr. 17, 1961, p. 573.

² For background, see *ibid.*, Jan. 2, 1961, p. 8; Mar. 6, 1961, p. 326; and Apr. 10, 1961, p. 514.

visers, as head of the delegation; Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury; Ambassador John W. Tuthill, Alternate U.S. Permanent Representative to the OEEC; William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

It is our hope to develop in the OECD a continuous working partnership in a spirit of flexibility and mutual accommodations among the officials responsible for economic policy in these 20 countries. The Paris meetings will be the first of many designed to build and strengthen relationships for dealing with common economic problems as they unfold.

The American people will follow with deep interest and high hopes the progress of this new venture in Western cooperation and unity.

U.N. Security Council Considers Jordanian Complaint Against Israel

Statement by Francis T. P. Plimpton¹

The United States Government regrets that a case involving a breach of the armistice agreement between Jordan and Israel is again before the Security Council. This is the first time in 2 years we have had to deal with such a problem. At the same time it is appropriate that the discussion has centered on the specific issue brought before us by Jordan, and I am hopeful that we can continue to concentrate our attention on that specific issue.

In our view the rehearsal for a military parade conducted by Israel in Jerusalem on March 17 in preparation for the Independence Day parade of April 20 was contrary to the General Armistice Agreement. A violation of the armistice agreement involving only a holiday parade may or may not constitute a threat to peace, as has been alleged. The degree to which such a violation of the armistice agreement might become a threat to the peace depends primarily on the respective atti-

tudes of the parties. In this connection I note that the distinguished representative of Israel has sought to reassure the Government of Jordan of the peaceful nature of the Israeli celebration.

It may well be that both parties in the past have been responsible for violations of article VII of the armistice agreement, violations involving varying amounts and types of military equipment. It may well be that these violations were not hostile in intention and, in substance, constituted no threat to the peace. And it may well be that the parade proposed by the Israeli Government for the 20th of April will, in substance, not constitute a threat to the peace. But the crucial question is: What effect do such violations have on the force of the armistice agreements and on the attitudes of the parties toward them?

In the case before us, one of the parties has lodged a complaint with the Mixed Armistice Commission, and the Commission has decided that the episode did indeed constitute a violation of the General Armistice Agreement. If we do not act wisely now, we may be faced with a series of formal complaints submitted by both parties which will erode the armistice agreement and the will of the parties to carry it out. That would indeed constitute a threat to the peace. Such a situation can easily be avoided by adherence in the future not only to the substance but to the form of the armistice agreement.

It is true that the Mixed Armistice Commission might have been able to handle this matter in another way, perhaps along the lines of the experience of the 1958 Israeli military parade in Jerusalem, which, we understand, was held pursuant to arrangements worked out in the field by the Commission. But this has not happened. Instead we have before us a specific finding by the Mixed Armistice Commission made according to the proper procedures.

We believe the authority of the truce supervision machinery on the spot should be upheld. We realize the imperfections of the armistice agreements. We are aware that all parts of the agreement are not fully implemented and that others are occasionally violated. Nevertheless we are convinced that the armistice agreement and the machinery to carry it out is an essential element of peace and stability. We support the armistice agreements fully.

¹ Made in the Security Council on Apr. 11 (U.S./U.N. press release 3687). Mr. Plimpton is Deputy U.S. Representative in the Council.

It is fundamental to the continuation of the present state of relative tranquillity in the area that both parties to the armistice agreement observe it in spirit and in letter. We sincerely hope that all concerned will take steps to insure that the agreement is not again violated. All parties should refrain from acts which might tend to increase tension. Two wrongs do not make a right. Any retaliatory violations of the armistice agreement by either party, particularly for violations that are not ill-intentioned, could unnecessarily lead to serious circumstances. Given the frank ill nature of peace in the Middle East, both Israel and Jordan have a particularly heavy responsibility for the exercise of patience and statesmanship. The United States Government hopes that the Council will indicate its support for the principle that the effectiveness of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization machinery should be maintained and supported.

My Government has tabled the draft amendment before us as an addition to the draft resolution cosponsored by Ceylon and the United Arab Republic.² We are in accord with the position taken by the proposed draft resolution. Nevertheless we believe that this Council should take this opportunity to reaffirm its continuing concern that the General Armistice Agreements, so long as they shall govern the relationships between Israel and its Arab neighbors, must be complied with fully and in good faith. Over the years this Council has spent a considerable portion of its deliberations in endeavoring to assist the parties to the General Armistice Agreements in maintaining the tranquillity and stability in the Palestine area.

The purpose of the United States amendment is to put again on record the fact that compliance with the General Armistice Agreements is not a unilateral obligation. Neither party to any of the

General Armistice Agreements can expect that the other party will fully honor the provisions of that agreement if it itself is not prepared to show good faith in compliance. So long as the full General Armistice Agreements are in effect and still govern the relations of the parties, this Council must, we submit, take every appropriate opportunity to demonstrate its continued determination to insure their effectiveness.

WMO Commission for Hydrological Meteorology Meets in U.S.

Press release 203 dated April 11

The United States will serve as host to the first session of the Commission for Hydrological Meteorology of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), which will be convened in the international conference suite of the Department of State on April 12, 1961.

Max A. Kohler, Chief Research Hydrologist, Hydrologic Services Division, U.S. Weather Bureau, is serving as first president of the Commission and will preside at the opening session.

At the third congress of the WMO in April 1959 the United States urged the creation of a Technical Commission for Hydrological Meteorology to deal with the Organization's work in the field of water resources, and the Chief of the U.S. Weather Bureau recommended that the United States serve as host to the first session.

Invitations were issued to member countries of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, as well as to approximately 12 nongovernmental organizations interested in hydrology. Of the 108 member states and territories eligible to attend, it is estimated that about 40 will send delegations. Approximately 70 delegates are expected to attend the meetings.

The Commission will develop its work program and will discuss the relationship of the Organization with other international groups concerned with water resources. Technical matters to be considered include river forecasting techniques, observation networks, publication and exchange of data, and standardization of terminology, codes, and units. The conference will be in session until April 26.

² The joint draft resolution (U.N. doc. S/4784) endorsed the decision of the Jordan-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission of Mar. 20 and urged Israel to comply with this decision. The U.S. amendment added a paragraph requesting the members of the Mixed Armistice Commission to cooperate so as to insure that the General Armistice Agreement will be complied with. The joint draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by the Security Council on Apr. 11 by a vote of 8 to 0, with 3 abstentions (Ceylon, U.A.R., U.S.S.R.).

United States Delegations to International Conferences

IAEA Board of Governors

The Department of State announced on April 5 (press release 193) that the following are the members of the U.S. delegation to the 21st session of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which is scheduled to be held at Vienna, April 5-14.

Governor

Robert E. Wilson, Commissioner, Atomic Energy Commission

Alternates

Edward L. Brady, U.S. Mission to the International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna

Mose L. Harvey, U.S. Mission to the International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna

Advisers

Joseph W. Clifford, International Affairs Division, Atomic Energy Commission

Dwight M. Cramer, U.S. Mission to the International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna

Betty C. Gough, U.S. Mission to the International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna

John A. Hall, Assistant General Manager for International Affairs, Atomic Energy Commission

Ernest L. Stanger, Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs, Department of State

John P. Trevithick, U.S. Mission to the International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna

This session of the Board will consider, among other things, an amendment of the IAEA statute giving greater representation for Africa and the Middle East on the Board of Governors, the program and budget for 1962, and a request from Yugoslavia for a reactor and nuclear fuel.

Diplomatic Conference on Maritime Law

The Department of State announced on April 13 (press release 217) that the following would be members of the U.S. delegation to the Diplomatic Conference on Maritime Law, which will be held at Brussels, April 17-30:

U.S. Representative

Robert E. Seaver (*chairman*), Chief, International Affairs Division, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce

Alternate U.S. Representatives

Leavenworth Colby, Chief, Admiralty Division, Department of Justice

Ely Maurer, Assistant Legal Adviser for Economic Affairs, Department of State

Advisers

Arthur M. Boal, Tompkins, Boal and McQuade, New York, N.Y.

William D. English, Office of General Counsel, Atomic Energy Commission

Richard C. Hagan (*secretary of delegation*), Office of International Conferences, Department of State

John W. Mann, Assistant Chief, Shipping Division, Department of State

Leonard J. Matteson, Bigham, Englar, Jones and Houston, New York, N.Y.

Howard Meyers, U.S. Mission to the European Communities, Brussels

Marcus Rowden, U.S. Mission to the European Communities, Brussels

This Conference is being convened for the dual purpose of considering at the governmental level (1) an international convention governing third-party liability for certain damage which might result from operations of nuclear-powered ships and (2) an international convention on the unification of certain rules relating to the carriage of passengers by sea and specifying the liability to each passenger in event of his death or personal injury. In addition the Conference will be asked to recognize an official status for the traditional Diplomatic Conference, which since the early 1900's has formulated international conventions in the field of maritime law.

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography¹

General Assembly

United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities. Guide to the Draft Articles on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities adopted by the International Law Commission. A/CONF. 20/8. January 25, 1961. 105 pp.

Letter of January 24 from the chairman of the Soviet delegation addressed to the President of the General Assembly concerning the question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi. A/4689. January 28, 1961. 2 pp.

Letter of January 31 from the permanent representatives of Burma, India, the Soviet Union, and the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the General Assembly concerning the question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi. A/4691. January 31, 1961. 2 pp.

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

Security Council

Report from the special representative of the Secretary-General in the Congo on the situation in Orientale and Kivu Provinces. S/4745, February 22, 1961, 9 pp.; Add. 1, February 23, 1961, 1 p.

Report addressed to the Secretary-General by his special representative in the Congo concerning Patrice Lumumba, consisting of an exchange of letters between the special representative and Mr. Tshombe. S/4688/Add. 2, February 25, 1961, 6 pp.

Report dated February 24, 1961, to the Secretary-General from his special representative in the Congo on the civil war situation in the three main sectors of the Congo. S/4750, February 25, 1961, 6 pp.; Add. 1, February 25, 1961, 1 p.; Add. 2, February 25, 1961, 2 pp.; Add. 3, February 25, 1961, 1 p.; Add. 4, February 28, 1961, 2 pp.; Add. 5, March 1, 1961, 2 pp.; Add. 6, March 2, 1961, 3 pp.; Add. 7, March 7, 1961, 3 pp.

Report dated February 27, 1961, to the Secretary-General from his special representative in the Congo on incidents in Léopoldville involving personnel. S/4753/Corr. 1, February 28, 1961, 1 p.

Report of the Secretary-General on certain steps taken in regard to the implementation of the Security Council resolution adopted on February 21, 1961. S/4752/Corr. 1, February 28, 1961, 1 p.; Add. 1, March 3, 1961, 11 pp.; Add. 2, March 5, 1961, 3 pp.; Add. 3, March 6, 1961, 4 pp.; Add. 4, March 9, 1961, 3 pp.

Report dated March 2, 1961, to the Secretary-General from his special representative in the Congo on U.N. protected areas. S/4757, March 2, 1961, 4 pp.; Add. 1, March 3, 1961, 4 pp.

Economic and Social Council

Economic Commission for Africa

International action for commodity stabilization and the role of Africa. E/CN.14/68. November 5, 1960. 40 pp.

United Nations programs for technical assistance in public administration. E/CN.14/89. November 16, 1960. 10 pp.

Report of the workshop on extension of family and child welfare services within community development programs held at Accra from November 21 to December 3, 1960. E/CN.14/79. December 1960. 82 pp.

Transport problems in relation to economic development in west Africa. E/CN.14/63. December 6, 1960. 125 pp.

The impact of Western European integration on African trade and development. E/CN.14/72. December 7, 1960. 101 pp.

Economic Bulletin for Africa, Vol. 1, No. 1, part A, Current Economic Trends. E/CN.14/67. December 27, 1960. 132 pp.

African economic statistics. E/CN.14/67 (statistical appendix). December 27, 1960. 18 pp.

Regional cartographic conference for Africa. E/CN.14/78. December 29, 1960. 14 pp.

Community development in Africa. Report of a U.N. study tour in Ghana, Nigeria, Tanganyika, and the United Arab Republic, October 15-December 3, 1960. E/CN.14/80. December 30, 1960. 29 pp.

Work of the Commission since the second session. Report of the Executive Secretary. E/CN.14/97. January 10, 1961. 42 pp.

Conference of heads of African universities and university colleges. Held at Khartoum December 20-22, 1960. E/CN.14/86. January 11, 1961. 27 pp.

Programme of Work and Priorities. E/CN.14/87/Rev. 1. January 1961. 24 pp.

Population Commission. Progress of work during 1959-60 and program of work for 1961-62 in the field of population. E/CN.9/164. January 4, 1961. 20 pp.

TREATY INFORMATION

U.S. and Viet-Nam Sign Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations

Press release 186 dated April 3

A treaty of amity and economic relations between the United States and Viet-Nam was signed on April 3 at Saigon. Ambassador [Elbridge] Durbrow signed the treaty for the United States, and Vu van Mau, Minister of Foreign Affairs, for Viet-Nam.

The treaty is the first of its type to be entered into between the two countries. It affirms the friendly and cooperative spirit prevailing in the relations of the two countries and records the mutual acceptance by them of a body of principles designed to promote the continued growth of those relations along mutually beneficial lines.

The new treaty contains 14 articles. It is of the short, simplified type of general treaty that the United States has been negotiating with a number of countries but contains the general substance of the normal treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation. Each of the two countries:

- (1) agrees to accord within its territories, to citizens and corporations of the other, treatment no less favorable than it accords to its own citizens and corporations with respect to carrying on commercial and industrial activities;

- (2) formally endorses high standards regarding the protection of persons, their property and interests;

- (3) recognizes the need for special attention to the stimulation of the international movement of investment capital for economic development; and

- (4) affirms its adherence to the principles of nondiscriminatory treatment of trade and shipping.

For the United States, the conclusion of this treaty represents a further step in the program being pursued for the extension and modernization of its commercial treaty structure and the establishment of conditions favorable to foreign investment. For Viet-Nam, it constitutes further

indication of the intent to pursue a policy devoted to promoting the economic growth of the country.

The treaty will be transmitted as soon as possible to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification. In Viet-Nam the treaty requires the approval of the National Assembly. When the ratification processes of both Governments have been completed, it will enter into force 1 month after exchange of ratifications.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Automotive Traffic

Convention on road traffic with annexes. Done at Geneva September 19, 1949. Entered into force March 26, 1952. TIAS 2487.

Accession deposited: Rumania (with reservations), January 26, 1961.

Economic Cooperation

Convention on the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development and supplementary protocols nos. 1 and 2. Signed at Paris December 14, 1960.¹

Ratification deposited: United States, April 12, 1961.

Fisheries

Convention for the establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission and exchange of notes of March 3, 1950. Signed at Washington May 31, 1949. Entered into force March 3, 1950. TIAS 2044.

Adherence deposited: Ecuador, April 7, 1961.

Postal Services

Universal postal convention with final protocol, annex, regulations of execution, and provisions regarding air-mail, with final protocol. Done at Ottawa October 3, 1957. Entered into force April 1, 1959. TIAS 4202.

Ratification deposited: Poland, February 23, 1961.

Telecommunications

International telecommunication convention with six annexes. Done at Geneva December 21, 1959. Entered into force January 1, 1961.²

Accession deposited: Haiti, March 29, 1961.

BILATERAL

Austria

Counterpart settlement agreement, with related exchange of notes of March 10 and 28, 1961. Signed at Vienna March 29, 1961. Enters into force on the date that the Government of Austria notifies the United States that the agreement has been ratified.

Brazil

Agreement providing for a grant to the Government of Brazil to assist in the acquisition of certain nuclear research and training equipment and materials.

¹ Not in force.

² Not in force for the United States.

Effected by exchange of notes at Rio de Janeiro October 10, 1960, and March 17, 1961. Entered into force March 17, 1961.

France

Agreement on cooperation in intercontinental testing in connection with experimental communications satellites. Effected by exchange of notes at Paris March 31, 1961. Entered into force March 31, 1961.

Morocco

Agreement relating to investment guaranties authorized by section 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 847; 22 USC 1933). Effected by exchange of notes at Rabat March 31, 1961. Entered into force March 31, 1961.

Viet-Nam

Agricultural commodities agreement under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 455; 7 USC 1701-1709), with exchange of notes. Signed at Saigon March 25, 1961. Entered into force March 25, 1961.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Confirmations

The Senate on March 28 confirmed the following nominations:

William Attwood to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 196 dated April 5.)

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle to be Ambassador to Spain. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 191 dated April 4.)

William McCormick Blair, Jr., to be Ambassador to Denmark. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 195 dated April 5.)

Aaron S. Brown to be Ambassador to Nicaragua. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 179 dated March 31.)

J. Kenneth Galbraith to be Ambassador to India. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 183 dated April 3.)

Edwin O. Reischauer to be Ambassador to Japan. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 197 dated April 5.)

John S. Rice to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 199 dated April 7.)

Edward G. Stockdale to be Ambassador to Ireland. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 180 dated March 31.)

Kenneth Todd Young to be Ambassador to Thailand. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 189 dated April 4.)

Appointments

Clark S. Gregory as International Cooperation Administration representative in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, effective April 10. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 216 dated April 13.)

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publication, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4604. 2 pp. 5¢. Agreement between the United States of America and India, amending the agreement of September 26, 1958. Exchange of notes—Signed at New Delhi May 13 and 21, 1959. Entered into force May 21, 1959.

Tracking Station. TIAS 4605. 6 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Federation of Nigeria. Signed at Lagos October 19, 1960. Entered into force October 19, 1960.

German Assets in Spain—Termination of Obligations Arising From Accord of May 10, 1948. TIAS 4606. 10 pp. 10¢.

Protocol between the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the French Republic and Spain—Signed at Madrid August 9, 1958. Entered into force July 2, 1959. With exchange of notes.

International Development Association. TIAS 4607. 30 pp. 15¢.

Articles of agreement between the United States of America and Other Governments. Approved at Washington by the Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development January 26, 1960. Signed for the United States of America August 9, 1960. Instrument of acceptance by the United States of America deposited August 9, 1960. Entered into force September 24, 1960.

Interchange of Patent Rights and Technical Information for Defense Purposes. TIAS 4608. 10 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Portugal—Signed at Lisbon October 31, 1960. Entered into force October 31, 1960.

German External Debts. TIAS 4609. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Other Governments, amending the administrative agreement of December 1, 1954, as amended. Signed at Bonn August 29, 1960. Entered into force August 29, 1960.

Weather Stations—Cooperative Program on Guadeloupe Island. TIAS 4610. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and France, extending the agreement of March 23, 1956, as supplemented. Exchange of notes—Signed at Paris December 23, 1959, and July 25, 1960. Entered into force July 25, 1960. Operative retroactively July 1, 1959.

Defense—Weapons Production Program. TIAS 4611. 12 pp. 10¢.

Arrangement between the United States of America and France. Exchange of notes—Signed at Paris September 19, 1960. Entered into force September 19, 1960.

Commission for Educational Exchange. TIAS 4612. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Spain, amending the agreement of October 16, 1958. Exchange of notes—Dated at Madrid June 3 and October 18, 1960. Entered into force October 18, 1960.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: April 10-16

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C. Releases issued prior to April 10 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 186 of April 3, 193 of April 5, and 200 of April 7.

No.	Date	Subject
201	4/10	Rusk: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
202	4/10	Gullion: "Disarmament Issues and Prospects."
203	4/11	WMO Commission for Hydrological Meteorology.
*204	4/10	U.S. participation in international conferences.
*205	4/11	Moscow film festival.
†206	4/12	Renegotiation of certain tariff concessions by Japan.
207	4/11	Rusk: arrival of Chancellor Adenauer.
208	4/12	Berle: Bar Association of City of New York.
*209	4/12	Cultural exchange (Jordan).
*210	4/12	Reception for African ambassadors.
*211	4/12	Harriman: Westinghouse conference (excerpts).
212	4/12	Visit of Chancellor Adenauer to Texas (rewrite).
213	4/12	Rusk: Rockefeller Public Service Awards.
214	4/13	Investment guaranty agreement with Morocco.
215	4/13	Bowles: National Council of Churches.
*216	4/13	Gregory sworn in as ICA representative in Rhodesia and Nyasaland (biographic details).
217	4/13	Delegation to Diplomatic Conference on Maritime Law (rewrite).
†218	4/14	Visit of Prime Minister of Greece (rewrite).
*219	4/14	Miss Willis sworn in as Ambassador to Ceylon (biographic details).
*220	4/14	Visit of President of Indonesia.
*221	4/15	Bunn appointed Counsel to President's Disarmament Adviser (biographic details).

*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

Africa. Africa Freedom Day (Kennedy) . . .	638	United States and Morocco Sign Investment Guaranty Agreement	643
American Principles. The Foundations of World Partnership (Bowles)	629	North Atlantic Treaty Organization. President Kennedy Reaffirms U.S. Support for NATO . . .	647
American Republics		Presidential Documents	
The Inter-American System and the Program for Economic and Social Progress (Berle)	617	Africa Freedom Day	638
Pan American Day (Kennedy)	615	Pan American Day	615
Atomic Energy		President Congratulates Soviets on Orbiting a Man in Space	639
Disarmament Issues and Prospects (Gullion) . .	634	President Emphasizes Importance of EPC Meeting at Paris	648
IAEA Board of Governors (delegation)	651	President Extends Greetings to First President of Togo	639
Civil Service. Rockefeller Public Service Awards (Rusk)	640	President Kennedy and Chancellor Adenauer Hold Informal Talks	621
Communism. The Foundations of World Partnership (Bowles)	629	President Kennedy Reaffirms U.S. Support for NATO	647
Congress, The		Publications. Recent Releases	654
Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	645	Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Gregory appointed ICA representative	654
President Recommends Participation in Effort To Save Nubian Monuments	643	Science	
Department and Foreign Service		Building an International Community of Science and Scholarship (Rusk)	624
Appointments (Gregory)	654	President Congratulates Soviets on Orbiting a Man in Space	639
Confirmations (Attwood, Biddle, Blair, Brown, Galbraith, Reischauer, Rice, Stockdale, Young) . .	653	WMO Commission for Hydrological Meteorology Meets in U.S.	650
Rockefeller Public Service Awards (Rusk) . . .	640	Sudan. President Recommends Participation in Effort To Save Nubian Monuments	643
Disarmament. Disarmament Issues and Prospects (Gullion)	634	Togo. President Extends Greetings to First President of Togo	639
Economic Affairs		Treaty Information	
Diplomatic Conference on Maritime Law (delegation)	651	Current Actions	653
The Inter-American System and the Program for Economic and Social Progress (Berle)	617	U.S. and Viet-Nam Sign Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations	652
President Emphasizes Importance of EPC Meeting at Paris	648	U.S.S.R. President Congratulates Soviets on Orbiting a Man in Space	639
U.S. and Viet-Nam Sign Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations	652	United Arab Republic. President Recommends Participation in Effort To Save Nubian Monuments	643
Germany. President Kennedy and Chancellor Adenauer Hold Informal Talks (Adenauer, Kennedy, Rusk, text of joint communique)	621	United Nations	
International Law. Diplomatic Conference on Maritime Law (delegation)	651	Current U.N. Documents	651
International Organizations and Conferences		President Recommends Participation in Effort To Save Nubian Monuments	643
Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings	646	U.N. Security Council Considers Jordanian Complaint Against Israel (Plimpton)	649
Diplomatic Conference on Maritime Law (delegation)	651	Viet-Nam. U.S. and Viet-Nam Sign Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations	652
IAEA Board of Governors (delegation)	651		
Pan American Day (Kennedy)	615		
President Emphasizes Importance of EPC Meeting at Paris	648		
WMO Commission for Hydrological Meteorology Meets in U.S.	650		
Israel. U.N. Security Council Considers Jordanian Complaint Against Israel (Plimpton)	649		
Jordan. U.N. Security Council Considers Jordanian Complaint Against Israel (Plimpton)	649		
Morocco. United States and Morocco Sign Investment Guaranty Agreement	643		
Mutual Security			
Building an International Community of Science and Scholarship (Rusk)	624		
The Foundations of World Partnership (Bowles) .	629		
Gregory appointed ICA representative in Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland	654		
President Recommends Participation in Effort To Save Nubian Monuments	643		

Name Index

Adenauer, Konrad	621
Attwood, William	653
Berle, Adolf A	617
Biddle, Anthony J. Drexel	653
Blair, William McCormick, Jr	653
Bowles, Chester	629
Brown, Aaron S	653
Galbraith, J. Kenneth	653
Gregory, Clark S	654
Gullion, Edmund A	634
Kennedy, President	615, 621, 638, 639, 643, 647, 648
Plimpton, Francis T. P.	649
Reischauer, Edwin O	653
Rice, John S	653
Rusk, Secretary	623, 624, 640
Stockdale, Edward G	653
Young, Kenneth Todd	653

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC
EDITORIAL DEPT
313 N FIRST ST
ANN ARBOR, MICH
DSB-DEC

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)



the
Department
of
State

CUBA

This 36-page pamphlet gives a clear-cut presentation of the existing situation in Cuba and its hemispheric implications. Its contents include: The Betrayal of the Cuban Revolution; The Establishment of the Communist Bridgehead; The Delivery of the Revolution to the Sino-Soviet Bloc; and The Assault on the Western Hemisphere.

In its concluding section the pamphlet states, in part,

"... The United States, along with other nations of the hemisphere, expresses a profound determination to assure future democratic governments in Cuba full and positive support in their efforts to help the Cuban people achieve freedom, democracy, and social justice.

"We call once again on the Castro regime to sever its links with the international Communist movement, to return to the original purposes which brought so many gallant men together in the Sierra Maestra, and to restore the integrity of the Cuban Revolution."

Publication 7171

20 cents

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed And:

\$.....
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me copies of *CUBA*.

Name:

Street Address:

City, Zone, and State:

